

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XVII, No. 6. DECEMBER, 1939

THE FLIGHT FROM THE CITIES

FOR the Catholic community in Great Britain the Government's evacuation scheme for removing children out of the crowded areas into places where there is less danger of air raids has brought problems of immense difficulty which do not affect the other religious denominations in at all the same degree. It is no exaggeration to say that the evacuation has confronted the Church with a crisis comparable with the great influx of Irish immigrants after the famine in the 'forties ; and it must be expected that many problems which have now arisen will continue long after the war is over. The main difficulty arises from the fact that, for historical reasons, the Catholic population of England and Wales, and still more of Scotland, is overwhelmingly concentrated in and around a relatively small number of industrial and shipping cities, while the Catholic revival has penetrated very little outside those areas. In these crowded districts there has been for nearly a century a continual expansion of Catholic life and organization, which has provided ample churches and religious schools. But in the rest of Great Britain churches are still few and far between, and in many counties Catholic elementary schools scarcely exist. Yet the air-raid evacuation scheme has inevitably sent hundreds of thousands of children out of precisely those districts where Catholic organization has been effectively developed into the areas where religious facilities are very restricted.

This extremely localized distribution of the Catholic population is clearly revealed in the annual statistics published by the *Catholic Directory*. In Scotland, where the estimated total Catholic popu-

lation for 1938 was about 615,000, about 450,000 were claimed by the archdiocese of Glasgow and some 85,000 more live in the archdiocese of St. Andrews and Edinburgh ; yet the two sees together comprise barely one-fifth of the total area of Scotland. In Wales the distribution is still more localized. Menevia, which includes all Wales except the two small counties of Glamorgan and Monmouthshire, had only 15,000 Catholics in 1938, whereas the archdiocese of Cardiff, which comprises those two counties and also Herefordshire, had 85,000. In England also a similar concentration has existed for close on a hundred years. The total estimated Catholic population of England, excluding Wales, is 2,275,000. Liverpool, Salford and Lancaster have respectively 400,000, 300,000 and 100,000, forming a compact area to which the northern counties of Lancaster make an almost negligible contribution ; and to this combined total of roughly 800,000 Catholics in the district surrounding Liverpool and Manchester must be added also the greater part of the 95,000 in the diocese of Shrewsbury, which has only a thinly distributed Catholic population outside the fringe of the Liverpool area. While this compact north-western district accounts for nearly 900,000 of the total 2,225,000 in England, there is another similar concentration around London. Westminster, which includes Middlesex and Hertfordshire as well as London north of the Thames, has 300,000, and Brentwood, which comprises Essex, has roughly 70,000 more. London south of the Thames, together with Surrey and Kent, accounts for probably at least 150,000 more out of the 190,000 in Southwark. What is vaguely known as Greater London, therefore, may be said to include some 500,000 Catholics.

With 900,000 Catholics in industrial Lancashire and 500,000 in Greater London, there are only 800,000 Catholics in all the remainder of England ; but these also are concentrated in several clearly

defined districts. Hexham and Newcastle is almost the only diocese which has shown a definite shrinkage of Catholic population in recent years, as a result of migration from the Depressed Area of Tyneside. But it still includes some 215,000 Catholics, of whom the great majority are congregated in the industrial and shipping area. The diocese of Leeds, with some 150,000 Catholics, provides another concentration, though its industrial cities are more numerous. And yet another concentration is in the archdiocese of Birmingham, with 160,000 Catholics, of whom relatively few live in Oxfordshire or Worcestershire, while the majority live either in Birmingham and its subsidiary towns or in the industrial centres of Staffordshire. And even in the sees with smaller populations such as Portsmouth or Plymouth or Clifton, the relatively small Catholic population is still mainly centred in the seaport towns.

The explanation of these peculiar conditions is, of course, well known. Even in Lancashire and Yorkshire, where a strong proportion of old Catholics remained throughout the penal times and where their descendants are now conspicuous as leaders of the Catholic community, the bulk of the Catholic population still consists of descendants of the great immigration of Irish refugees in the late 'forties and in the subsequent decades. Cardinal Manning declared even in the 'eighties that "four fifths" of the Catholics in England were Irish, but he would probably have been surprised to find that more than fifty years later, in spite of inter-marriage and complete assimilation to English surroundings, their descendants would still be concentrated in the same areas where the pioneers of the Catholic revival built the first churches and the first Catholic schools.

How Manning would have risen to the opportunities which have been created by the present crisis, for extending the Catholic revival more widely

throughout the country ! It is a remarkable proof of the attachment of Catholics to their churches and their schools that, through so many vicissitudes of unemployment, they have shown so little inclination to move elsewhere. Yet Manning, with his hatred of urban life, would surely have seen in the evacuation of the children a supreme opportunity to remove them from the squalor of industrial tenements and to create new openings for them in healthier and less sophisticated surroundings. At the same time he would have been quick to proclaim the possibilities of forming new centres of Catholic life in the large areas where so little progress has been made since his day. Would he not have felt that the exodus of the Catholic children into the countryside had introduced a new phase in the life of the Church in Great Britain, bringing opportunities very similar to those which followed upon the influx of hundreds of thousands of helpless refugees from Ireland ?

"It was the influx of Irish in 1846 and the following years," wrote that staunch Englishman Bishop Bernard Ward, in his *Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*, "which made our congregations what they are, and led to the multiplication of missions." The conditions which he describes before their arrival are little different in essentials from those which still prevail in many of the counties to which the evacuated children have been sent in these recent weeks. "The English Catholics," he writes, "relied for the building of their churches almost solely on the donations of the few hereditary Catholics and others of the upper classes ; after the great Irish immigration it became possible to build from the pennies of the poor. Many missions owe their very existence, including serviceable churches and schools, to the large Irish congregations. If any proof be wanted of the importance of the immigration it is only necessary to cast one's eyes on those parts of England, as, for example, East Anglia, whither the

Irish hardly penetrated, and to see the desolate state of those counties so far as the Catholic religion is concerned. Even in Lancashire and the northern counties generally, where the number of English Catholics was far greater than in other parts of the country, the congregations were largely increased and many missions established, due in many cases in great measure to the influx of Irish immigrants."

Substitute "evacuated children" for "Irish immigrants", and the quotation becomes singularly appropriate today. It may be answered that the evacuation is only a temporary measure, and that the children will at most remain away from the cities for the duration of the war. But it would be a very sanguine view to assume that industrial and commercial employment in the cities will ever return to its pre-war level, once the war has devoured the foreign investments upon which export trade and shipping so largely depend, and when the country is saddled with a new war debt very probably as large as that bequeathed to us by the last war. To take for granted that the great cities, and particularly London and the shipping centres, will retain their former capacity for providing employment is a very rash assumption, for it implies that after the exhaustion of the present war we shall still be in a position to obtain imports on the former scale from all parts of the world. It is surely more reasonable to expect that the standard of living in the cities will inevitably decline, and that a much larger proportion of the people will be obliged to earn their living by manual labour, and especially on the land.

Whether that prospect be viewed cheerfully or otherwise, it is needless to emphasize the enormous immediate difficulties created for the Catholic Church by the evacuation of the children. Obviously, the clergy cannot leave their parishes, where the adults remain; even the schools may have to be kept going

to some extent for those children who have not gone away. The number of priests must inevitably be reduced by the demand for chaplains to the fighting services, which cannot be left unanswered. And with their numbers thus depleted by war service the clergy are obliged to keep the normal life of their parishes in full activity, while also providing for the children who have been dispersed into remote areas. It is unfortunate indeed that not only has the need for such dispersion fallen upon precisely the areas where the Catholic population is congregated, but the "safety areas" are those in which the Church has made so little headway. The position in this respect is worse even than might be expected. It is true that the population of Great Britain as a whole is concentrated in great cities, and that the problems of evacuation affect all denominations. But the proportionate concentration of Catholics in the "danger zones" is much greater, and the proportion of Catholics in the "safety areas" is much smaller, than the average.

Some startling results emerge from an examination of the *Catholic Directory* statistics in this respect. The position in Scotland may be described briefly by saying that nearly three-quarters of the Catholics live in Glasgow and the Clydeside, and about one half of the remainder live in Edinburgh and its vicinity. The total population of Scotland is roughly 4,900,000, of whom some 3,200,000 live in the areas comprised in the two archdioceses. In the remaining four-fifths of Scotland there are roughly 80,000 Catholics with only 205 priests and 194 churches, in a total of 1,700,000 people. In Wales the Catholic concentration around Cardiff and Newport and Swansea reflects the high proportion of people who have established themselves in the industrial and mining areas of the extreme south. The total population of Wales is roughly 2,600,000, of whom some 800,000

live in Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire, where some 80,000 Catholics are congregated. But in the west of Wales there are some 1,800,000 people, and only 15,000 Catholics with 156 priests and 87 churches or chapels.

In England the cities and towns are much more widely distributed, and the figures for the Catholic dioceses show some disconcerting contrasts. The outstanding feature, of course, is the great preponderance of the North. If you draw a rough line from Liverpool to Hull, and include the Catholic population of the northern part of the diocese of Shrewsbury, you will find that approximately 1,250,000 of the 2,225,000 Catholics in all England live in this northern area, which is roughly one-third of the country. But this concentration in the North is clearly divided into several regions, and some of the northern counties have very few Catholics. Two-thirds of them live in that north-western corner which may be described as industrial Lancashire, and the remaining third live either in the north-eastern industrial region of Tyneside or in Yorkshire. But the proportion to the total populations is considerably smaller in the north-east than in the north-west. Even in the north-west the archdiocese of Liverpool has a higher proportion of Catholics than the others. In Liverpool they are one in six ; in Salford and Lancaster they are one in nine. The Salford diocese contains 2,700,000 people, with 300,000 Catholics ; while the see of Liverpool has some 2,400,000 people and 400,000 Catholics. Hexham and Newcastle has 215,000 Catholics out of 2,250,000 and Middlesbrough has only some 80,000 Catholics in a population of over 1,000,000 ; while the diocese of Leeds has nearly 3,400,000 people with 155,000 Catholics.

But compared with the southern industrial areas these proportions in the north are much higher. The most largely populated diocese in the whole country

is Southwark, with about 5,100,000 people, of whom some 190,000 are Catholics. Westminster comes second with 4,500,000 people and about 300,000 Catholics. The archdiocese of Birmingham comes third with 3,600,000 people and only 160,000 Catholics, which is roughly the same proportion as in Leeds. Next comes Nottingham, with 2,650,000 people and only 65,000 Catholics—or roughly one in forty ; and next is Northampton—which includes the seven counties of Bedford, Buckingham, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Norfolk, Northampton and Suffolk. In this very large area, containing over 2 million people, there are only 33,000 Catholics—a proportion of one in sixty, which is the lowest in England and is about the same as that of Menevia. In the diocese of Portsmouth, also, which comprises Berkshire and Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, the Church has penetrated very little beyond the principal towns and seaports, and there are only 55,000 Catholics in a population of nearly 1,400,000. The large dioceses of Clifton and Plymouth show similar conditions, with roughly 30,000 Catholics out of about 1,500,000 people in each, who are chiefly congregated in a few cities such as Bristol and Plymouth.

If the map of England and Wales as a whole were coloured by counties showing the distribution of Catholic populations it would be seen that from Cornwall, Devon and Dorset through Somerset, Wiltshire, Berkshire, Oxfordshire and across the seven counties of Northampton diocese to the eastern coast there is not one county which contains ten thousand Catholics. In the south-east from London to the sea there is a large concentration, and there are two important areas around Birmingham and Cardiff. But all the rest of Wales shows the same thin distribution, and it is only in the northern midlands that churches become numerous, while they are so many in the north-west and the north-east that the *Catholic*

Directory is obliged to insert specially enlarged maps for these districts.

But there is another side to the picture if one examines the progress of even the past twenty years with special reference to the present problems. The cumulative growth of Catholic population through the country is larger than most people realize. Since 1914 the total has grown from roughly 1,800,000 to nearly 2,400,000 today ; but much more important is the remarkable increase in the number of priests and of churches and chapels. It is well worth while to examine the records of this growth in some detail, for the facts throw a good deal of light on the present problem and the means that must be found for meeting it. It will be seen that the newer churches have been very largely built in the districts where development had been most backward, and this applies not only to the dioceses where Catholics are still few but to others like Southwark or Lancaster, which have many Catholics in some parts and few in others.

To a large extent the first difficulties have been overcome by the opening of country districts within the past twenty years. The results are to be seen already in dioceses like Southwark or Shrewsbury or Portsmouth, which have had wholesale evacuation from their cities but in which many of the children have remained within the diocese, being sent to small villages inland. Today there is usually some nucleus from which religious facilities can be provided for them, whereas twenty years ago there would have been no church or priest within many miles. While this opening up of new districts has been most rapid in the more highly organized dioceses it has proceeded no less notably in those like Northampton and Clifton and Plymouth and Menevia where the difficulties have been greatest. And a further advantage has arisen through the remarkable growth of religious

communities in recent years. The number of regular clergy has increased from about 1,300 in 1914 to over 2,000 today ; and it is very fortunate that many of these are established in communities in those dioceses which have had to deal with a great influx of evacuated children. In the history of the Catholic revival the pioneer work of the religious orders as missionaries among the Catholic immigrants during the past century has been one of the chief factors in the Church's growth. It would seem that circumstances have once more brought the need for them to resume their labours as missionaries in new fields, and it may well be that their efforts will have an equally lasting effect.

DENIS GWYNN.

CÆSAR-WORSHIP, ANCIENT AND MODERN

II.—MODERN

(i)

IT was in the year A.D. 323, ten years after what is traditionally known as the Edict of Milan, that the Emperor Constantine formally exempted Christians from participation in pagan State ceremonies. The Roman Cæsar-cult lingered on for nearly half a century longer, but its sting had been drawn. Its real significance had not lain in the reckoning of one deity more or less amid the many deities of polytheism. It had lain (as we have seen) in its representative character. The cult had given unity to polytheism and been the symbol and the focus of the State's moral absolutism. Its power as the unifier of religions throughout the Roman world was broken when strict monotheism was made lawful for Roman citizens. And State absolutism in the moral sphere was cut at the roots when recognition was given to the Christian's right to follow his conscience in the matter of religion.

It is true that the absolutist tradition remained immensely strong. There was a tendency for even the Catholic Emperors to think of their religion as a State institution to be made the instrument of State policy. Indeed, this tendency eventually led in the East to the separation of the self-styled patriarchate of Constantinople from the centre of Catholic unity. But in the West, where the machinery of the ancient Roman State broke down and the Empire was reconstructed after an interval of chaos on a fully Catholic basis, the break with the evil tradition was complete. There were echoes of it in the language of Charlemagne, the first Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, but the actual structure of the Christendom

that was coming to birth was modelled upon the language of the Popes.

Consequently such claims to the supremacy for the civil power over the spiritual as were occasionally put forward by Emperors or jurists in the West in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had the character of anachronisms and antiquarian revivals. Even the rise of the national monarchies in the fourteenth century, and of principalities on the classical model in Italy in the fifteenth, could not so far subvert the Catholic tradition as to elevate the State over men's consciences. Not until Protestantism had taught men to rebel against the divine authority of the Church was theological sanction given to the moral absolutism of the lay ruler.

Then the principle that every region must follow the religion of its prince was written into the public law of Germany and eventually (in 1648) of all Europe. In the same period the doctrine of the divine right of kings was formulated by the Scottish heir to the English throne.

Even then the political institutions of Europe remained nominally Christian. It was not until the eighteenth century that the philosophy of Liberalism completed the demolition of the traditional foundations of European society by proclaiming the principle that the State should be completely dissociated from religion. And only in the last decade of the century was this principle actually adopted by two States, France and the newly born United States of America.

The immediate result, in France at least, was startling. For, by an apparent paradox, this principle of the dissociation of the State from religion opens the way to the completest form of State absolutism over religion.

It is not difficult to see why. The State that repudiates religion repudiates the ultimate sanction for the limitation of its own powers. At the same time

it acquires an animus, not only against the public profession of religion by the State, but also against the private profession of any form of religion that concerns itself with the spiritual and moral character of the State and of politics. From this attitude towards religion it is but a short step to suppressing religion altogether in the name of an avowedly atheist State or, alternatively, to reducing its ministers as far as possible to the status of State officials and prohibiting whatever is not subjected in this way to State control.

In France, where the working out of Liberal principles was done at full speed under intense pressure, their logical outcome was reached within a few years. Within four years of the outbreak of the Revolution State Atheism was proclaimed for the first time in history ; and eight years later, under the more realistic rule of Napoleon, the alternative of a State-regulated religion was adopted, in recognition of the fact that Catholicism was the religion of "the great majority of Frenchmen".

These assertions of the State's moral absolutism were accompanied by a near approach to the actual deification of the State. In the first phase altars were set up to La Patrie, and children baptized in its name. In the second phase Napoleon, as his megalomania grew, spoke of himself as a theocrat who should control both the Empire and the universal Church. But a lay theocrat who believes in no God, but only in his destiny, is claiming the powers, if not the honours, of a deity.

(ii)

All this, however, was only a rehearsal for a still distant consummation. One god-State could not survive alone in the heart of a still largely Christian

Europe ; and, when Revolutionary France was overthrown on the battlefield in the person of Napoleon, Catholicism became the religion of the French State again for another ninety years. It was necessary for revolutionary nationalism to germinate in the lands to which it had been carried by the revolutionary armies, and for the Great War to pulverize almost all that remained of the structure and traditions of Christendom, before there could be a general European movement towards the god-State and conditions favourable to the growth of regular Cæsar-cults.

The contribution of revolutionary nationalism was primarily psychological. Before the French Revolution there had existed a number of peoples, each identifiable by a common culture or language or descent, but each content to live under alien rule and even to be divided between several rulers. The gospel of revolutionary nationalism inspired each of them with a desire for political as well as cultural or racial unity, and for political independence with it. The same gospel gave to peoples who had already achieved Statehood an emotional exaltation in their lives as States similar to that which had inflamed the French nation in its revolutionary wars and in the orgy of State-worship which accompanied them.

To peoples in both groups it offered some sort of emotional substitute for religion. And presently, as the nationalist States became more highly organized and more disposed to monopolize the direction of all the activities of their citizens, a patriotism to which all else had to be subordinated began to be imposed as a rival to the religion previously in possession. The tendency was particularly strong in Prussia where a philosophical basis for State-absolutism had been provided by the Prussian philosopher Hegel, and an administrative basis for it by a strong bureaucratic tradition.

The Great War of 1914-1918 brought the process

to a head by throwing most of the greater European States into the melting pot. Not only did it destroy innumerable constitutional survivals and traditions. It broke down also psychological restraints, so that the lower passions ran riot unimpeded ; and it left men (whom it had accustomed to violence) with weapons in their hands. Consequently, in the States in which disintegration had gone furthest, the control of the State became a prize to be fought for by private armies inspired by propagandists appealing to the crudest emotions.

But the war did more than reduce institutions to fluidity. It brought about great developments in the technique of central bureaucratic control whereby any group that had once possessed itself of power by the manipulation either of mobs or of electorates could acquire a permanent hold over the lives of the citizens. Alternatively, the civil service itself might become the concealed and anonymous but all the more effective dictator of a totalitarian State.

The war brought even greater developments in the technique of psychological control. The creation and manipulation of mass-feeling and mass-opinion by governments was one of the principal weapons of the conflict itself ; and in the post-war period it became one of the principal instruments of the absolutist State. Nor had any previous generation seen so elaborate an apparatus of mental formation, through universal education, cheap press and radio, as was available to the governments in question.

Thus the belligerent nations were left by the war with large potentialities for violent reconstruction, and for subsequent regimentation under governments with unprecedented resources. They were left also with immensely heightened images of themselves. Men either saw their nation as the hero, victorious or treacherously vanquished, of the greatest war in history ; or else they reacted against this militaristic

self-glorification of the nation and surrendered to the even more absolute claims of the promised super-State of the international revolution.

(iii)

These alternative states of mind, nationalistic and internationalistic, were respectively given shape by two philosophies of life, opposed to one another in type and in detail but both deriving, somewhat remotely, from the philosophy of Hegel and each leading, if pressed to its logical conclusion, to the virtual deification of the State. These philosophies or outlooks on life were Marxism and Fascism.

Marxism is the spiritual heir of Liberalism. It dates from the heyday of the Liberal era. It draws on the basic assumptions of Liberal economics. It shares their abstractness that simplified economic analysis by dealing with man solely as an economic entity. It shares also the materialism that endorsed this simplification, and the determinism that logically followed from the materialism. It shares also the tendency of Liberalism to disintegrate political society both in theory and in practice, though it substituted a sectionalism based on class for an atomization based on extreme individualism.

Finally, it reproduced in its own manner the internationalism of Liberalism by making class an international conception, just as Liberalism had insisted on the international character of the economic activities of the individual atoms composing the nation States. In spite of this internationalism, however, it put forward a demand for that reconstruction of the State by a highly centralized despotism which was the inevitable conclusion of the disintegrating process.

This conclusion was implicit in Liberalism because

political society under the action of Liberalism ceases to be organic, that is to say, it loses the social nexus provided by a hierarchy of natural groups—guilds, corporations, “estates” and the like—standing between the central government and the individual. When this has happened nothing short of a centralized despotism based on force can save the State from complete collapse. And Marxists have never shown any reluctance to use this force within nation States in default of the international super-State of their official creed.

Correspondingly on the spiritual plane Marxism carried to their absolutist consummation the secularist tendencies of Liberalism and its disposition to dissociate the State and all civic activities from religion and religious influences. In Russia, where it took over an already absolutist tradition, it openly set State atheism at the heart of political and economic reconstruction.

Fascism, on the other hand, is the antithesis of Liberalism, and reaches the morally absolutist State (when it does reach it) by steps that are in contrast with those of Liberalism at every point. (It should be understood that the term Fascism is used here primarily in its original sense, namely to denote an Italian movement formally founded by Benito Mussolini in March 1919. This was, as its name implies, originally a movement of fighting squads, privately organized but assuming the functions of the State in combating revolutionary and, particularly, international forces which by their violence or their propaganda were threatening the unity and the traditions of the nation and with which Liberal politics could not cope. The term Fascism is also used here in its secondary meaning to denote movements in other countries, particularly Germany, using similar methods to achieve the same general object ; for method rather than theory is the distinguishing

mark of Fascism. The term is not used here at all in the tendentious and misleading sense in which it is commonly used by the Left Wing Press in most countries, to denote almost any Right Wing movement or, indeed, almost any movement, even Catholicism itself, which has incurred the Left Wing's displeasure and has at times had an accidental connexion with Right Wing politics.)

Fascism, then, stands at the opposite pole to Liberalism and Marxism in respect, first of all, of its origin, for it is wholly a post-war product. It is opposed to them, secondly, in its hatred of abstractions, for it is essentially an incitement to action, placing will before reason and exploiting the emotions, particularly those cruder passions everywhere released by the Great War. Similarly it disdains the materialism of Liberal-Marxist economics and, still more emphatically, their determinism.

Above all it proclaims the organic unity of the State against both the atomism of Liberalism and the sectionalism of Marxism, and the internationalism of both. It is nationalist in essence and not merely as a makeshift, and aims at national unity by an emotional fusion of all classes in the nation and not by the extermination of one class by another.

Indeed, it tends to press this attitude to a point at which the State ceases to be organic in the salutary sense (as defined above) and becomes organic in the bad sense. In other words, the organic State of Fascism is liable to be conceived, not as a unity constituted by an ordered hierarchy of living and spontaneous groups, but as having, like a biological organism, purposes of its own transcending and overriding those of the individual members composing it (though, in fact, the State has no immortal soul or eternal destiny, while its humblest citizen has both).

(iv)

If, therefore, we wish to define the relations of Marxism and Fascism respectively to the State's moral absolutism (which is the essential basis of Cæsar-worship) we shall have to make a series of contrasts as regards their manner of approach to this moral absolutism, and nevertheless recognize that there can be substantial identity between them in the ultimate outcome.

In the first place, Marxism considered as a political system approaches the State's moral absolutism indirectly, while Fascism and analogous movements considered as political systems approach it directly. In Marxist theory the State is only an instrument. For Fascism the State is central, and never far from being made an end in itself. But Marxism, though it makes the State only the instrument of a class, regards it as an instrument to be used without any limitations upon its power by the proletariat when that class is in possession.

Furthermore, the eventual elimination of the State in a classless society, which is the theoretical goal of Marxism, can only be reached through the extermination of every other class and of every trace of every other class outlook. So long, therefore, as the Marxist State lasts (and in practice it shows no signs of eliminating itself) its operations are directed without limit to enforcing the standpoint of a single class whose class-interest is the avowed criterion of Marxist morals. The moral absolutism thus indirectly reached is at least as complete as, and considerably more arbitrary than, the moral absolutism to which the Fascist State tends through the fusion of all sectional and individual interests in a single overriding State morality in which "what helps the people is right".

A similar contrast between the direct approach of

Fascism and the indirect approach of Marxism to the State's moral absolutism can be made in respect of the totalitarian element in the two systems, that is to say, in respect of the extent to which they bring under the State's control the whole range of the citizen's activities. Fascism is totalitarian avowedly and by direct intention. "Everything in the State, nothing against the State, nothing outside the State" is one of Mussolini's sayings. Marxism is conceived primarily in terms of economics ; and the control which the Marxist State exercises over the totality of its citizens' activities is exercised through its economic control.

But this restriction does not amount to much either in theory or in practice. According to Marxist theory all the activities of human life are ultimately expressible in terms of economics. Religion, in particular, is said to be merely an attempt to console oneself with an imaginary other world when economic satisfaction is lacking in this one. Furthermore, everything possible is done to ensure that the economic control exercised by the State does in fact touch every side of life. The State is made the absolute owner of all the means of production, so that almost overwhelming economic pressure can be, and is, brought to bear upon the behaviour of every citizen even in those spheres which are most remote from economics.

Thirdly, if we consider the psychological preparation for totalitarian absolutism in the Marxist and the Fascist State respectively there is, once more, a sense in which it can be said that the Fascist approach is the more direct. For it is of the essence of the Fascist method to attain the moral unity of the State by a direct emotional appeal designed to arouse intense patriotic passion and a fervid pride in the nation's power. Thereby Fascism hopes to bring about the voluntary surrender of every citizen to the moulding influences of the State.

The appeal of Marxism is, by contrast, abstract and intellectualist. It can only be translated into emotional terms in the negative and sterile form of class hatred. In handling the masses, therefore, for the purpose of political construction, Marxism must rely upon naked violence. To recognize and act upon this truth was, in fact, the historical role of the section of Marxists known in Russia as Bolsheviki ("the majority"). But this violence, not restrained by any necessity or desire for gaining the good will of all sections of the community (nor, of course, by any moral scruples), is capable of bringing about a more abject submission to the State's moral fiat than any Fascist emotional pressure.

Eventually the propagandist machine of the Bolsheviks made use of emotional appeals barely distinguishable from the Fascists. In 1934 Stalin set himself to rouse patriotic feelings that had been officially non-existent since 1917; and five years later he declared that the invasion of Poland by the troops of the U.S.S.R. was for the assistance of their "blood brothers". But there was no relaxation of physical terrorism. The same five years saw an increasingly ruthless use of force to terrorize dissenters from the regime.

(v)

The fourth and, in some respects, the most important factor in the establishment of the morally absolutist and totalitarian State is the philosophy and (if we may so speak of it) the theology of the two movements we have been describing. Here their positions are to some extent reversed. The bearing of Marxist theology and philosophy on the question is, if not direct, at least definite. Materialism and atheism are of their essence, for Marxism is before all

else a doctrine of the predetermined working out of an historical process by economic forces in a wholly material universe. By this atheism Marxism eliminates any possible superior or rival to the morally absolute god-State ; and by its materialistic and deterministic view of human nature it eliminates the only solid basis for the assertion of moral independence by the citizen. Its partiality for mass-handling and mechanization, by which men are further depersonalized, is merely the reflection of this philosophy in the practical conduct of affairs.

Fascism, on the other hand, has not, as such, any theology or even any systematic philosophy, unless a persistent empiricism in the State's outlook on morals can be called a systematic philosophy. It is true that many of its pioneers were atheists and the great majority of them anti-clericals ; but that was more or less an accident, caused by the secularist atmosphere of the Liberal State against which they were politically reacting. Nothing so metaphysical as atheism was ever made part of the Fascist creed, and the way was always open for the Fascist State to profess even Catholicism if that should be necessary for its totalitarian unity. Even anticlericalism had to be kept out of sight by Italian Fascists when it suited their leader's political strategy to be on good terms with the Vatican.

It is true, again, that atheism is implicit in the Fascist account of the State if that is logically pressed. "The Fascist conception of the State is all embracing ; outside it no human or spiritual values can exist, much less have value," is an assertion by Mussolini¹ that would seem to mean that the realm of the Spirit is wholly comprised in what the State can create or contain. But no such deduction is intended to be made from pronouncements of this type, nor in fact is made in Italy either in theory or in practice. In

¹ *Enciclopedia Italiana*, 1932.

practice this dictum means in Italy that the Fascist State will not allow anything regarded by the mass of its citizens as of vital spiritual value to remain outside the State. The State, in fact, makes provision for the teaching of the whole Catholic faith in all grades of its educational system and even in the training of Fascist youth.

It would be possible in like manner to take other Fascist slogans and deduce the most startling consequences concerning the necessity for the complete surrender of citizen's conscience to the State or to the Duce. But, here again, Fascist totalitarianism, being of the empirical rather than of the *a priori* kind, nullifies Fascist moral absolutism where the people is predominantly Catholic and the Fascist leader is truly a realist. The Italian Fascist State, precisely in order that it should be really all-embracing, gives legal recognition to the moral system of Catholicism ; and the moral system of Catholicism is by its nature antecedent to the State.

It is true that the Church in Italy has been forced to compromise in respect of the extent to which claims to an organized Catholic life are to be pressed beyond the necessary minimum. But where free scope is given for the working of the sacramental system, for the integrity of the family, for religious education, and for the practice of the moral law in the necessary relations of daily life—when this much is secured against totalitarian pressure, the sting of the State's moral absolutism has been drawn in respect, at least, of the private lives of the citizens, whatever claims may be made for the superiority of the State itself to moral considerations.

In this capacity for permitting so vast an exemption from its professed moral totalitarianism Fascism stands poles apart from Marxism with its rigid *a priori* metaphysics, its reliance upon sheer violence to enforce them, and its deliberate blindness to the actual

needs and desires of individual citizens. But the very empiricism that makes this practical compromise with the moral law and revealed religion possible for Fascism makes its attainment uncertain and its continuance precarious. Too much depends upon the Leader's sense of realities. In the case of National Socialism, the German analogue of Fascism, that sense of realities has been defective, and a Concordat with the Holy See, made in imitation of Mussolini in the first months of the regime, was being systematically violated two or three years later both in letter and in spirit.

Furthermore, where there is no systematic philosophy inherent in a movement there is room for arbitrary philosophical borrowings. There is nothing to prohibit Fascism from adopting a philosophy that eliminates God and the moral law, and makes absolutist claims for the State, with an explicitness and rigidity that the natural flexibility of the movement would never countenance. In this also Nazism deviated from its Italian prototype. Not only has it in the background, as part of the national tradition, the absolutist political philosophy of Hegel. It has itself given official countenance to a racialist absolutism of its own—racialist largely because of the accident that the Nazi Leader was not at first a citizen of the State he aspired to rule and therefore laid stress on the supposed racial unity of Germans.

A racialist pantheism was formulated which regards the German race as the supreme good, and "blood" (or "blood and soil") as the foundation of the moral virtues. From this it was deduced that whatever promotes either the unity or the purity of the race, from war to sterilization, is a moral duty binding on the German conscience.

This inevitably led to an indictment of the Church as an enemy of "the German soul" on the ground that

she requires her members to submit their consciences to the guidance of a supra-racial authority. Protestants who maintained in their own language the absolute claims of the Divine Law came under the same condemnation. There was no essential difference here between Nazism and Marxism in respect of the moral absolutism of the State.

(vi)

Thus Fascism and Marxism in their different ways each made their contributions—political, administrative, psychological and philosophical—to the re-establishment of that morally absolutist State which, except for a dress rehearsal in Revolutionary France, had made no actual appearance upon the European stage since Constantine and Licinius met at Milan. And, with this re-establishment, the worship of the State and of the ruler of the State became once again a possibility.

Indeed, the attribution of moral absolutism to the State is in itself a virtual deification of it, since it attributes to the State a moral transcendence as the criterion of good and evil that is the prerogative of deity alone. And when, in addition to claiming an "absolute ethical meaning" for the State, Mussolini adds that "the Fascist State is itself conscious, and has of itself a will and a personality"¹ the process of deification might seem to be complete, in words at least. In Nazi Germany similar language is used of the German race.

Moreover, every citizen who knowingly surrenders his conscience to be formed by the State is rendering to Cæsar what belongs uniquely to God. And if we extend the word religion to include all collective emotionalism finding its outlet in something like acts

¹ *Enciclopedia Italiana*.

of faith and worship, then all morally absolute and totalitarian States, Fascist or Marxist, tend to create their own religion. All of them, from the very extent of their claims, must enforce those claims by methods more akin to the preacher's than to the legislator's. They must come into the field as rivals of the Church in departments of mental and moral formation that no law can touch, inside and outside school, in working hours and in playtime, wherever men, women or children gather together. And they look for a response that in substance if not in form is an act of adoration—addressed either to the State or to its ruler.

It seems certain that sooner or later these demands will be met both in form and in substance in one or more of the morally absolutist totalitarian States. Already the ritual of religious worship has been adopted in some of them for purposes allied to Cæsar-worship.

In estimating the significance of these manifestations, however, we must allow for their general religious background and for national idiosyncracies of temperament and expression. Thus the altar in pagan Roman style erected on the Capitol in honour of the Fascist dead must be set against the Catholic altar which stands in the Fascist headquarters not far off, before which Fascist neophytes may pray and keep vigil like the Knights of Christendom. And the elaborate pagan ritual with which the Nazi dead are honoured in Germany must be taken in conjunction with the fact that the only approach made by the Nazi State to Christianity (apart from the many times violated Concordat) has been to set up a State Church of "German Christianity".

Nazism, indeed, has moved far along the road towards open idolatry. The notorious revivals of the worship of the deities of pagan Germany may perhaps be dismissed as the extravagances of a few, but the

same cannot be said of the deliberately cultivated neopagan atmosphere of the organizations for Youth. Nor is it possible to set limits to the possible developments of the pagan ceremonies devised for marriage and other solemnities, should Nazism survive the present war. Still more significant is the language used about the Nazi Fuehrer. Not "God and Hitler" but "Hitler and God" are held up as objects of loyalty to the youth of Germany. "God's revelation to the German people" is an expression officially used of Hitler ; and the Minister for Church Affairs elaborated this idea when (in February 1937) he said :

"The question of the Divinity of Christ is ridiculous and inessential. . . . A new authority has arisen as to what Christ and Christianity really are, Adolf Hitler."

In Russia the psychological characteristics of Marxism have told heavily against quasi-religious ceremonial. Nevertheless, in the cult of the dead and embalmed Lenin, the Bolsheviks have gone further towards promoting real idolatry than any of their totalitarian rivals. And it looks very much as if some sort of cult of the living Stalin is in preparation, perhaps through his portraits—in the land of ikons.

Admittedly it is difficult to conceive the state of mind in which a living man could actually be worshipped in twentieth century Europe. It is difficult enough to conceive the psychology of the ruler-cult of the Greeks in the sophisticated Hellenistic age. Indeed, we can only approach a solution of that problem by reminding ourselves of the decay of the Greek idea of a deity until it differed scarcely at all from that of a superman, and we cannot easily apply that explanation to a Europe whose consciousness has a millenium and a half of monotheism behind it.

Yet the demoralization of minds that have lost the faith and surrendered to powers of evil can be fearfully rapid ; genuine belief in superstitions is in

evidence all around us ; and the formative power of the propaganda of a twentieth century totalitarian State is beyond calculation. Moreover, we have good reason in Scripture for holding that worship of a ruler who sets himself up as God will be a phenomenon of the last phase of the world's history, into which (it would seem) we have already entered.

To enlarge on this topic, however, would be to go beyond the scope of the present essay, which has fulfilled its purpose if it has shown that the political and mental preparation for a revived Cæsar-worship is nearing completion.

F. R. HOARE.

METHOD IN MARIOLOGY

TO anyone who had remained out of touch with the Mariological writings of the past twenty years it would probably never occur to raise the question whether our Blessed Lady contributed with Christ to the price of our Redemption. And if by any chance the question were put to him, it is likely that he would immediately and instinctively answer in the negative, even expressing some surprise that it should ever have been asked. Surely, he would say, it was Christ alone who bought salvation for humanity, Christ alone who reconciled us with God and by His merit and satisfaction made grace once more available for mankind! This, the instinctive reply of the moderately instructed Catholic, was also the reply given, not instinctively but deliberately and after due consideration, by two of the greatest theologians of modern times. "If," wrote Billot, "the title of Co-redemptrix, which certain authors do not hesitate to give to our Lady, were understood to mean that she made any contribution whatever to the price of Redemption paid by Christ, it would have to be numbered among those pious extravagances which, though doubtless excusable on the ground of intention, are none the less, objectively speaking, in formal contradiction with the most certain data of Catholic dogma."¹ The well-known theologian of the Eucharist, Père de la Taille, was no less emphatic. "Mary," he wrote, "did not merit her own redemption, whether condignly or equitably. Consequently she did not merit ours either; for there was but one redemption, accomplished by one act for the whole mass of the human race, though producing its effects differently in various cases, according as it preserved or cleansed."²

¹ Introduction to *Marie Mère de Grâce*, by De la Broise and Bainvel (Beauchesne, 1921), p. vi.

² *Gregorianum*, Sept., 1926, p. 394.

Such a weight of authority, ratifying what would appear to be the spontaneous view of the unsophisticated, might have been expected to be decisive. In point of fact this has been far from being the case. On the contrary, a census taken among the theologians who are now devoting their attention to the question would probably reveal a substantial majority in favour of the affirmative opinion. This does not prove that the affirmative opinion is true; but it does show that the question is not so simple as it seemed. A problem which at first sight presented no appearance of being a problem at all has now come to occupy the forefront of theological controversy. Articles about it appear frequently in learned reviews, patristic studies are devoted to its elucidation, it has more than once recently been the subject of a doctorate thesis; and no book of Marian theology can now be regarded as complete without a chapter on the Co-redemptrix. So keen, indeed, is the interest which the question has provoked—at any rate on the Continent—that it is confidently expected by many that an infallible definition may result. In the view of Fr. Friethoff, O.P.,¹ the history of the Mariological discussions of centuries ago is repeating itself today; just as the definition of the Immaculate Conception was preceded by a long controversy in which theologians sided for or against what was then a “pious opinion”—each party appealing to Tradition and Scripture, each party advancing arguments and urging objections which claimed alike to be based upon the most certain principles of revealed truth, each party quoting papal pronouncements and interpreting them in its own sense—so now Mary’s co-redemptive function is the subject of a similar debate. “Since it has not pleased the divine wisdom,” writes the learned Dominican, “formally and expressly to reveal Mary’s immediate co-operation in Christ’s

¹ *Divus Thomas* (Fribourg), June, 1939, p. 253.

work of redemption, the occurrence of this controversy is a great advantage and a grace of God."

Whether or no the controversy is destined to terminate in the manner suggested is not a speculation which we may yet profitably indulge, nor do we propose here to embark upon it. But, whatever may be its outcome, it will certainly not be a waste of time ; and to this extent Fr. Friethoff's parallel holds good. *Cunctas haereses sola interemisti in universo mundo.* The study of our Lady never is, and never has been, in vain, and the familiar antiphon formulates a law which has governed the development of Catholic doctrine. The vindication of Mary's true motherhood struck the death-knell of Docetism ; the defence of her perpetual virginity threw light on the true meaning of marriage ; Arianism, Adoptianism, Nestorianism, Monophysism fell back vanquished before the triumphant proclamation that Mary is the Mother of God. It is because the Mother of God is the point of contact between God and humanity, because in her God entered human history to redeem us, that we find concentrated in her all that the divine ingenuity has devised for the glorification of man ; and therefore it is true to say that to study Mary is to study theology in a focal point. The centuries of discussion which preceded the definition of 1854 are another proof of it ; for in the study of Mary's purity theologians discovered the true nature of original sin, in the study of her sinlessness they learned more of the evils to which our flesh is heir, in the study of her unique redemption they found a new appreciation of the Redeemer's power. We may therefore be certain that the current discussions on Mary's part in the Redemption will bear similar fruit ; for, whatever be the solution of the problem, that solution will not be reached without a thorough investigation of what Redemption means.

But it is neither the ultimate outcome nor the

incidental fruits of the controversy that we intend to discuss in this paper, which is concerned rather with the lessons that may be drawn from it in regard to theological method. We have remarked on the strangeness of the phenomenon that a theory frowned upon by great thinkers years ago, and still today rejected by theologians of note, should now have found so many ardent and able defenders. How are we to account for this difference of opinion? We are going to suggest that it is due to a difference of method, and that this in turn is due to a difference in the manner of approach.

Let us begin with what is fundamental, the manner of approach. Any scientific problem—and a theological problem is such—should be approached as far as possible in a spirit of detachment. This does not mean that the inquirer must be indifferent and uninterested; if he were he would not trouble to be an inquirer at all. Nor does it mean that he must necessarily be indifferent as to what may prove to be the result of his investigation; in many cases this is neither possible nor desirable. But it does mean that he should endeavour, in considering the evidence, so to detach his attention from any personal preferences which he may possess that these will not be allowed in any way to influence his judgement. More, perhaps, than any other theological treatise, Mariology has suffered from breaches of this rule. While it is true that the traditional devotion of Catholics to Mary has stimulated the study of her prerogatives, it must be admitted that this same devotion has sometimes impaired that complete serenity of mind which is indispensable for objectivity in research. A laudable desire to do honour to our Lady has not infrequently hurried theologians to conclusions which they might not otherwise have reached; predisposed them to accept in Mariology slipshod arguments which in other treatises would scarcely have been entertained;

inclined them to treat difficulties with less respect than they deserve, and even caused them to regard opponents as wanting in devotion to the Mother of God. After all, there seems to be no reason, as Fr. Lennerz has justly pointed out,¹ why the type of argument which would be considered invalid to prove the divinity of Christ or His Real Presence in the Eucharist should be thought to suffice in Mariology. "Neither truth," continues the learned professor, "nor the honour of our Lady has anything to fear from this insistence upon valid proofs ; for valid proofs do not obscure the truth but manifest it." Nor would it be fair, when a prerogative of our Lady is in question, to claim that devotion to Mary is the exclusive merit of those who accord her the privilege in debate. Among Catholic theologians such devotion must be assumed to be common to all. In two ways only could the love of Mary divide them, and that is, so far as it tended either to cloud the judgement or to influence the method of research. And it is in this second way especially, so it seems to us, that theologians are divided on the question that we are considering. They differ above all in their method of research.

"It has not pleased the divine wisdom," says Fr. Friethoff, "formally and expressly to reveal Mary's immediate co-operation in Christ's work of redemption." This is the basic truth which must determine the method of inquiry. Since it is agreed by all that the sources of revelation, Scripture and Tradition, do not tell us explicitly that Mary contributed to the price of redemption, it is evidently useless to question those sources in the manner of one expecting an explicit reply. To the plain question whether Mary with Christ paid the price of our salvation, their answer is—silence. If they contain the answer at all, they do not contain it in those words. Of one, and of one only, do they tell us this explicitly, and that

¹ *Gregorianum*, Vol. XIX (1938), p. 419.

one is Christ himself: "There is one God and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all. . . . You were not redeemed with corruptible things . . . but with the precious blood of Christ." If Scripture and Tradition have anything to tell us of the part which Mary played in that work, then we must seek it not in explicit statements, but in statements whose meaning is equivalent. This search for the implicit is above all a search for ideas, and for ideas in disguise, ideas that are clothed, not in the words by which they are normally expressed, but in the garb of other ideas to which they are related. It is therefore no blind fumbling, like groping in sawdust for a prize; it is an investigation which calls for previous knowledge. This "unfolding" of the implicit, this search for a meaning within a meaning, is a process in which the intellect must have a clear notion beforehand of what it sets out to find. The theologian has constantly to be asking himself the question: "Does this *mean* that Mary redeemed us?" This general statement, e.g. that she was intimately associated with her Son in the work of saving the world; this analogy, e.g. that she played a part in our salvation analogous to that which Eve played in bringing about our fall; these titles, e.g. *porta coeli*, *adjutrix redemptionis* and the like, which are commonly given her—is the meaning of all these equivalent to the meaning of objective co-redemption? And above all, and before all, what does Redemption mean?

Clearly, then, the implicitly revealed calls for a special method of investigation. In the case of explicit revelation the theologian's task is simple; he has merely, by applying the recognized laws of scriptural interpretation and patristic research, to establish that the revelation has been made. He is then immediately in possession of the truth revealed. But in the case of implicit revelation his task is twofold: he has not only

to collect the relevant statements, he has also to discover their implications. Both parts of the task are important ; but the first is useless without the second, nor can an intensified concentration upon the one compensate for the neglect of the other. The mere multiplication of implicit testimonies will never make them explicit ; they become explicit only when we have unfolded their meaning.

This is why it was said earlier that, in this problem of Mary's co-redemptive function, it is useless to question the sources of revelation in the manner of one expecting an explicit reply. It is true that, when a doctrine is explicitly revealed in Tradition, the very multiplication of patristic testimonies may be sufficient and decisive, in so far as it establishes the *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*. But in the present case the mere collection of texts is not only not conclusive ; it may even be positively harmful and misleading, especially for those who approach the subject with a predisposition to the affirmative view. For that predisposition makes the investigator prone to see his opinion implied in statements which do not *necessarily* imply it at all, with the result that in the accumulation of what he deems to be implicit testimonies he is led to see a weight of argument which does not really exist. Far more important than the collection of implicit arguments is the task of showing that they are in fact implicit arguments, i.e. that they really mean that Mary co-operated formally in objective redemption. And in order to show that, as we have suggested, it is above all necessary to know what Redemption means.

It thus becomes apparent that, if Mary is revealed to us as Co-redemptrix, it is by a process exactly the inverse of that by which Christ is revealed as our Redeemer. In the case of Christ, the *fact* of Redemption, which is explicitly revealed, comes first ; and it is in the light of the fact that the meaning of

Redemption is learned. In the case of Mary, the *meaning* of Redemption must come first ; and it is only in the light of the meaning of Redemption that we can establish whether, and in what sense, Mary co-redeemed us.

Consequently, in our opinion, the starting point of any inquiry as to Mary's part in Redemption should be, not an accumulation of patristic texts which may, or may not, mean that Mary redeemed us, but an intensive study of Redemption itself. That study, evidently, must be based upon revelation. What, the theologian must ask himself, is this act of Christ which the Scriptures call Redemption ? What is this price by which mankind is said to have been bought ? In what sense is this act exclusive to Christ, the Word Incarnate, the one mediator of God and men ? What is the common teaching of Tradition and of theologians about Christ's redemptive act ? Armed with the answers to these questions, and only thus armed, can he venture with impunity upon the task of disentangling and unfolding the implicitly revealed.

In this matter the experience of the past has important lessons to teach, and much may be learned in particular from the age-long debate on the Immaculate Conception, which illustrates admirably the elements of the method we have described. As the issue has now shown, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was from the beginning implied in the scriptural statement that Mary is full of grace and in the traditional testimony that she is sinless and all-pure. Nevertheless eighteen centuries passed before it clearly emerged ; and even after the question had been formally raised, seven centuries elapsed before the dogma was solemnly defined. What was the reason of this long delay ? Many causes undoubtedly contributed, but chief among them all was the uncertainty of theologians about the nature of original sin. Mary was sinless ; on that the teaching of Tradition was

explicit enough. But could that mean that she was conceived without original sin? The theologians who affirmed the doctrine relied for their argument upon the numerous texts of the Fathers in which Mary was called sinless, pure, and immaculate; in which general statements, they contended, her immunity from original sin was implied. Those who denied it, on the other hand, concentrated their attention upon the meaning of original sin itself. Was there, or was there not, in the very nature of that sin something which made it impossible for a human being, naturally conceived, to be preserved immune from it? Until that question had been answered little purpose was served by the industry of the collectors of texts; for the opponents of the "pious opinion" could easily reply, and did reply, that the titles accorded to our Lady by the Fathers must be understood of her freedom from actual sin, or at the most of her post-conceptual cleansing from the hereditary stain. In their view it was premature to conclude, from the general statements of Tradition about Mary's purity, that she was conceived without original sin, until it had been clearly established what original sin was. On the universality of that sin, on the unvaryingly regular transmission of the sin of Adam together with the nature of which he is the fount, the sources of revelation were explicit. Consequently, while the nature of original sin and of its connection with concupiscence was still a matter of dispute, the opponents of the privilege might with justice contend that those explicit, but vague and indeterminate, statements concerning Mary's sanctity could not imply that she was immune from a sin which—as it seemed to them—must inevitably accompany the normal process of generation.

The debate is now over, and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is a dogma of faith. But the fact that the opponents of the doctrine were wrong

in their opinion does not prove that they were wrong in their method. Indeed, as we look back upon those discussions in the perspective of history, it appears that those who denied the doctrine did more for the development of the truth than those who defended it ; for it was they who called attention to the necessity of clarifying the terms of the problem. They rightly argued that it was only in the light of what God had revealed about original sin that they could discover whether Mary was immune from it.

The position with regard to Mary's mediation is very similar today. There are those who collect patristic texts in which Mary is called the New Eve, *Mediatrix*, *Via salutis*, *causa nostrae salutis*, *causa reconciliationis*, etc. ; and they claim that these titles and similar statements imply that Mary co-operated formally in objective redemption. They are following the method earlier employed by the defenders of the Immaculate Conception ; they seek by an accumulated weight of general statements to establish the truth of a particular doctrine which may, or may not, be implied in them. Our Lady, said the theologians of old, is sinless ; therefore she was conceived immaculate. Our Lady, say these theologians of today, was uniquely associated with the work of the Redeemer ; therefore she paid the price of Redemption with Him.

Now it may well be that in their conclusion they are right. But if ever they are proved to be right, it will not be by this method. If the defenders of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had continued to confine their attention to the general and non-committal statements of Tradition, refusing to pay heed to the demands of their opponents that they should examine the meaning of original sin, then it is probable that the controversy concerning that doctrine would still be going on. In like manner, so it seems to us, if those who maintain that Mary is Co-redemptrix in the formal and objective sense, neglect to

consider carefully what Redemption is, we are not likely to see an early end to the debate.

What is the method of their opponents? It is strikingly similar to the method of those who denied the Immaculate Conception. They are neither unaware nor neglectful of the encomiums of Tradition on Mary's unrivalled association with the work of her Son. But they are less solicitous to multiply testimonies than to interpret their meaning, and in order to do this they are studying Redemption itself. In their view it is premature to decide in what sense Mary shared the work of her Son until it has been discovered, by a thorough investigation of the meaning of Redemption as universally accepted in the Church, in what sense that work is exclusive to the Word Incarnate, the one Mediator of God and men. In the opinion of these theologians, so far as the progress of their research allows them yet to pronounce one, there is indeed a sense in which the act of redeeming belongs to Christ alone, and that is: when it is considered as the activity (both propitiatory and meritorious, culminating in the sacrifice of Calvary) by which the Word Incarnate paid the price of our salvation and made grace accessible to mankind, our Lady included. And therefore they claim that the general statements of Tradition concerning Mary's association with the Redeemer do not—because, so far as at present appears, they cannot—imply that she co-operated formally in objective redemption. Consequently, they maintain, until it has been demonstrated clearly that it is not impossible for Mary, herself redeemed, to have contributed to the price of which she is the chief beneficiary, those statements must be interpreted in such a way as to be reconcilable with what seem to be the accepted conclusions of sound theology.

Their method may be illustrated, and perhaps justified, by comparison with the attitude of Catholic theologians towards the so-called kenotic theories

of Protestant Christology. With the explicit teaching of the Scriptures that God is changeless, the famous passage of St. Paul on the divine "self-emptying" appeared to be in contradiction. Faced with this apparent inconsistency, theologians have followed what is the only reasonable and logical course ; and they have explained the words of St. Paul in such a manner as not to contradict the explicit teaching of Revelation ; *obscura per clariora interpretando*.

To certain of the advocates of the affirmative view this method appears to be unsound, and they stigmatize it as inept and untheological.¹ Why not, they say, approach the sources of revelation without any preconceptions as to the impossibility of objective co-redemption, and accept the statements of Tradition in their obvious sense ? This criticism is interesting because it shows that the issue is at last being joined on the question of method ; and it augurs well for a speedy solution of the problem. It is especially interesting, however, in view of the supposition upon which it appears to be based, namely that the statements of Tradition do indeed contain the doctrine when understood in their obvious sense. Surely this supposition is quite unwarranted. Is it not agreed by all, and freely admitted even by Fr. Friethoff who is one of its most enthusiastic advocates, that the doctrine is not explicitly revealed, and therefore not contained in the statements of Tradition when understood in their obvious sense ? It is precisely because the doctrine is *not* explicitly revealed that it is necessary for the investigator to approach the sources with a preconception, a preconception derived from revelation itself, of what Redemption means. And if Scripture and Tradition appear to him to represent objective redemption as the exclusive work of Christ

¹ E.g. Père Bittremieux, *Ephem. Theol. Lovan.*, Vol. XV (1938), p. 366 ; and, following him, Fr. Carol, *Marianum*, Rome, ann. I (1939), fasc. ii., p. 238. Cf. *Marianum*, I, fasc. iv, p. 421, n.12.

alone,
of obj
concep
Les
caution
haps t
dogma
concer
conclu
ous qu
subject
traduc
yet th
to whi
soul o
among
time t
dividu
infusio
trover
well b
presen
traduc
certain
though
held i
But h
must
any d
was
certain
to be
of o
eliger
impu
anim
tione

¹ E.g.

alone, then he will legitimately approach the problem of objective *co*-redemption with a well-founded preconception of its impossibility.

Lest such an attitude appear to some to be over-cautious, or even obstinate, we may be allowed perhaps to take one more example from the history of dogma to justify it, repeating, however, that we are concerned primarily with methods and not with conclusions. In the days of St. Augustine the mysterious question of the origin of the human soul was a subject of debate. Although the grosser form of traducianism had by now been generally abandoned, yet the theory of spiritual traducianism (according to which the soul of the child is transmitted from the soul of the parent) found favour with many thinkers, among whom was St. Augustine himself. At the same time the view was becoming common that each individual soul is created by God in the moment of its infusion into the body. In this atmosphere of controversy St. Augustine assumed a position which might well be a model for the theologians of today in the present discussion. Himself inclining towards spiritual traducianism, he was nevertheless prepared under certain conditions to accept creationism which, though it has since become the teaching universally held in the Church, was then merely a "pious opinion". But he would accept it only on one condition: he must be assured beforehand that it did not contradict any doctrine which was already in possession, that it was not incompatible with any truth which was certainly revealed by God; in particular he required to be shown that it did not conflict with the dogma of original sin. "*Quaecumque enim (sententia) eligenda est,*" he wrote to St. Jerome, "*absit ut impugnet hanc fidem de qua certi sumus, omni animae etiam parvuli infantis necessariam esse liberationem ex obligatione peccati.*"¹ If this difficulty

¹ *Ep.* 166, 7.

(that the soul is in sin at the first moment of its existence) could be overcome, he would accept the view ; if it could not, then he would dissuade even St. Jerome from holding it : "Illa de animarum novarum creatione sententia, si hanc fidem fundatissimam non oppugnat, sit et mea ; si oppugnat, non sit et tua."¹ Nor could he be induced to shut his eyes to objections by the accumulation of scriptural texts whose meaning was ambiguous ; nothing short of an irrefutable argument from the sources of revelation would reconcile him to accepting so difficult a doctrine : "Nolo mihi dicatur, pro hac sententia (i.e. creationism) debere accipi quod scriptum est : *Qui finxit spiritum hominis in ipso, et Qui finxit singillatim corda eorum.* Aliquid fortissimum atque invictissimum requirendum est, quod nos non cogat Deum credere ullarum animarum sine culpa aliqua damnatorem."² The attitude of St. Augustine in the circumstances was neither inept nor untheological. It was the proper attitude for a theologian to adopt in a matter upon which revelation had not spoken clearly.

St. Augustine proved to be wrong in opposing the doctrine of creationism ; theologians were wrong in opposing the Immaculate Conception ; it may be that many theologians are wrong today in opposing the theory that Mary co-operated formally in objective redemption. But that does not prove that they are wrong in their method. On the contrary, they fulfil an essential function in the providential process of doctrinal development ; they promote what Gardeil called "le retour vers le donné primitif pour y trouver la sanction des développements acquis."³ No development of Catholic dogma is genuine which does not harmonize with the primitive content of divine revelation ; nothing is implicitly revealed by God which is seen to conflict with what He has

¹ Loc. cit., 25.

² Loc. cit., 26.

³ *Le donné révélé et la théologie*, 2nd ed., p. 162.

explicitly taught ; and therefore that primitive content remains for ever the objective standard according to which all the theories, inferences, and interpretations of theologians are to be judged. The final judgement rests with the infallible teaching authority of the Church. But in the meantime theologians pursue the task of comparing, on their guard constantly against the intrusion of human error. The theological mind is no more immune than any other from the temptation of wanting things to be true, and history provides examples in plenty of the extravagances to which an ill-restrained devotion may lead. To this tendency the method of which we are speaking applies a salutary corrective, recalling the reasoner again and again to the point from which he set out, indicating the difficulties which strew his path, and (eventually, perhaps) withdrawing him from a path which does not lead to the truth.

Those who refuse, be it only provisionally, to attribute to our Lady a function which would do her honour, perform an invidious task. Loving and revering her none the less for their prudent restraint, they address a friendly challenge to their theological opponents, of which St. Augustine's letter to St. Jerome may provide the wording : "Do not attempt, my prudent friend, to rescue me from my difficulties with arguments such as these. If a thing is not true, no amount of wishing will make it to be true. Yet, were it possible, I would fain this opinion were true. And if it be true indeed, I would have you prove it with a clear and unanswerable reason."¹

G. D. SMITH.

¹ Loc. cit., 26.

HOMILETICS

Sunday in the Octave of the Epiphany

*"And His Mother was keeping all these sayings in her heart."
(Luke ii, 51.)*

(1) Yesterday was the Feast of the Epiphany, but we reserve allusion to that until later. And the story in the gospel is the theme of the Fifth Joyful Mystery, so it too is well known and we recall it but briefly. Our Lady and St. Joseph went annually to Jerusalem for the paschal feast, and when Jesus was twelve years old He went with them. This was not a legal "coming of age", but it was held that then parents ought to treat their children more strictly and teach them, for example, to fast. They fulfilled the obligations of the feast, and started for home. Such caravans were tumultuous ; people went from one group to another. Jesus was thought, since they could not see Him, to be with relatives. That night, they realized that He was lost. They returned, on the next day, to Jerusalem, and, on the third, found Him in the Temple—not "teaching", nor even being taught : it was not a "class" that was being held ; the rabbis, or masters, themselves were gathered together, discussing legal or moral points, and Jesus was listening, asking questions, and Himself being asked. "They were amazed at His understanding and His answers." When His parents found Him thus, they were "astounded"—a still stronger word. He had never acted thus before. His Mother cried in anguish : "Son, why hast Thou done so to us ? See ! Thy Father and I have sought Thee in great grief !" His reply was no rebuff. Surely, with the gentlest of smiles He answered : "How was it that you sought Me ? Did you not know that I *must* be—with My Father ?" "In the things of My Father" : a vague expression : hardly more than *chez* ; not definitely either "about My Father's business", or, "in the House of My Father". In any case, the tremendous affirmation is the same—*God* is His Father ; God's work, His work ; God's House, His home." "And they did not understand what He had said to them." However, showing that God's work and perfect human obedience

were not incompatible, He went home with them to Nazareth and "subordinated Himself to them".

(2) But we concentrate on the words : "His Mother was keeping—continuously guarding—all these words [which means also *events*] in her heart." Not only does this verse, taken together with verse 19— "But Mary kept—preserved *together*—all these events, putting them together in her heart"—definitely convey that it was through Mary that Luke obtained his information, but the two verses throw a real light upon her spirit. In verse 51 we are told that she kept them in her heart, throughout, always, with out forgetting anything. In verse 19 we read that she "kept together", in due sequence, with the respective significance of each, the various things that had happened—the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Birth, the visit of the Shepherds—that was as far, then, as she could reach in the composition of that Rosary whose first group of Mysteries she completed when Jesus was found in the Temple at Jerusalem. She *noticed* : she retained the words and the facts : she did not get tired of them but went on doing so : she "pondered" them, putting them together in her mind and seeing how each threw light on each—thus, had there been "room for them in the inn", the shepherds would not have been able to enter or to find them : had the shepherds not come, they would not have been able to "make known" the news about the Child (*egnorisan* does not mean *cognoverunt* ; Luke ii, 17) : they told everyone, and everyone who heard them "was astonished by what the shepherds told them". And what a complex of events and prophecies did not the Presentation in the Temple involve ! Mary will have put that visit to the Temple "together with" this one, and have tried to see what "sense" they made, and have recognized this preliminary sword-thrust in her heart. She "did not understand" everything in a flash : even when she knew a "truth", like the Incarnation, she did not fathom it, as we say, all in a moment. Increase of knowledge is not only, or chiefly, horizontal—adding item to item—but a "seeing into", a "profoundening".

(3) A New Year resolution might be (i) to say the Rosary (for example, on Saturdays, or oftener) : (ii) to say it "properly", i.e. with reflection. Some degree of medita-

tion is essential for the right saying of the Rosary. It is more important than attending to the words. *Mention* each Mystery as you come to it. Perhaps, choose *one* phrase, e.g. "The Lord is with thee !" and apply it to Our Lady in each Mystery as you come to it. Thus, "He is with thee" even when He seems lost : even when He dies. *Resurrexi, et adhuc tecum sum* : despite the more terrible "three days' loss", yet am I with thee ! Notice how this Mass insists on knowledge. Indeed, the sonorous Prayer asks that we may find strength to accomplish "that which we have seen", but we require to see it first ! "That we may see what we ought to do." We are, says the Epistle, to offer our very bodies as a "reasonable" sacrifice to God—our reasonable service. We are not to be "clever", erudite, ingenious in speculation—at least that is not asked of us as Christians : but we are to aim at a modest, docile *knowledge* all the same. So another resolution can be, to *learn* more about our faith during this year ; to allow no day to pass without reading at least one page which makes us "see deeper" into what we already believe, so as also to be able to explain it to others if need or opportunity arise, and "manifest His glory". Our tiny co-operation with the Epiphany !

The Second Sunday after Epiphany

"Whatsoever He shall say to you—Do it !"

(John ii, 5.)

(1) The story is familiar. Our Lady was present at a marriage in Cana ; Jesus also was invited—perhaps because His new friend Nathaniel came from there, and Cana lay between Capharnaum whither they had gone from the south, and Nazareth, to which Jesus was returning. It was maybe the arrival of these extra guests that caused the wine to run short. Our Lady said to Him : "They have no wine !" (Admirable prayer—to expose the facts, in simplicity and faith, to God, and then leave Him to act. Yet at times He wishes us to "insist upon praying" [Epistle] : to urge : to implore. So be it—yet always with calm ; not

as though God had to be forced to listen, despite the astonishing parable of the Unjust Judge and the Importunate Widow.) Our Lord said to her in often-explained words: "Mother"—in English His word corresponds to that far more nearly than to "Woman"—"What is to Me and to thee?"—words defying all *translation*! We are assured by scholars that the little phrase was indeed a refusal in these circumstances, which is also clear from "My hour is not yet come", which we feel sure does *not* refer to His Passion (why should it?) but to the moment when He meant to begin His public life accompanied by Messianic "signs" (this also shows that He understood her to *be* asking for a miracle—faith of Mary! she has so far not seen Him work any, but knew that He *could*. She had "pondered"—seen the connection between what He *was*, and what He *could*). Yet the phrase takes its "colour" wholly from the tone in which it is uttered. Arabs, it appears, still say almost the same, meaning: "Why worry? It'll be all right." And she knew it would be! She said to the servants: "Whatever He says to you, do it." He ordered the six huge jars to be filled; they filled them to the brim with water: they poured—it had become wine, better than they had had so far. "Pursue hospitality!" (Ep.)

(2) We hold that St. John wrote history, but that he chose his episodes *in order* to drive home spiritual truths. He selected his "signs" out of very many (xx, 30, 31). And the general theme of his gospel is the bringing of a New Life into the world—not the abolition of the old, but its "vivifying", a word so often used in the Missal. After a moment he will speak indeed of the substitution of the Living Christ for the ancient House of God, the Temple: and here the water is indeed turned out of water into wine: but allegory was precisely what he was *not* writing: we are not to seek for detailed and accurate parallels to the physical events related in the spiritual truths taught. Enough that the Coming of Christ brings with it that which was as far better than even the divine religion of the Jews, as rich wine is than colourless tasteless water. That water would have served sufficiently for the "purification of the Jews": but He had kept for His Kingdom not only a better water, but wine. This "elevation" is accomplished in the Christian by Grace.

And Grace is given, according to Christ's Covenant, chiefly through the Sacraments. The Post-Communion for this Sunday asks that the "working of God's power may be increased within us", so that "by Thy Gift we may be prepared to receive—accept—assimilate—the Promises of those Divine Sacraments whereby we are *vitalised* . . ." "*Vegetati*" ! Would that an adequate word could be found for that ! Another reason for familiarizing oneself even to a small extent with the liturgical Latin so that we *need* not translate ! "To vegetate" means, in English, to lead a mere "vegetable" existence. . . . It is recommended to convalescents, who must make no effort ; who must not even think ! But in Latin, it refers to the new and springing sap which sends up the year's triumphant growth. *That* is what God's Grace should do within us. It should create not only a new life, but a life forthwith displaying itself in activity—in "works"—not necessarily things we had never done before, but a supernaturalized version of those works—the same works, yet divinely electrified, to change the metaphor.

(3) Only in this way shall we even begin to be able consistently to do all that St. Paul, in the Epistle, tells us to do. And he agrees ! Even if the "gifts" he refers to at the beginning are "graces" rather than Grace, yet they have Grace at the back of them ; they are all thought of as "in the name of the Lord" ; as done "in Christ" : the gifts are derivatives of the Gift. He then hurls out at us a number—almost a jumble—of small sentences : but out of twenty-five, two only seem to concern God directly ; five, the personal spiritual life directly. All the others concern "the brethren" and their service. "Whatsoever He shall tell you to do, *do* it !" Our Lord did not turn the water into wine just for the sake of a miracle—even for the "manifesting of His Glory". He did it, that the guests might drink. God, says the Prayer, governs things both "heavenly and earthly". We do not think it means, by "heavenly", only the stars and so forth. . . . He governs both the spiritual and supernatural life, and the things of earthly daily life, and He wishes the former to exist in us so strongly that at once it bubbles up, overbrims, and refreshes the whole world.

*Third Sunday after Epiphany.**Stretching out His hand. (Matt. viii, 3.)*

(1) The gospel for today contains two miracles which indeed "manifest" Christ's true mission, and heart, and therefore His Glory; but they were also miracles which added enormously to the suspicion already clouding up around Him—that He scorned the Law and even the prerogatives of Israel. A leper approached Jesus—already an infringement of the regulations, for these wretched creatures were utterly taboo; and Jesus stretched out His hand and touched him, saying in reply to his piteous affirmation—"If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean"—"I will; be thou clean". St. Mark vividly adds that Our Lord was "moved with compassion": the word is a very strong one: "His Heart was wrung with compassion" seems to me the "flavour" of that word. Our Lord had done even worse, officially speaking, than the leper, of whom we are not told that he actually touched Jesus, though, had he actually flung his arms around His knees in his desperation, Our Lord would not have minded. But He was, now, Himself technically "unclean". Into how different a world of tender, unfearing love have we now moved! Even the Prayer falls short of this revelation of Christ's Heart: we ask God to look propitiously towards our weakness; and, to protect us, that He should "stretch out to us the right hand of His Majesty". Safe, indeed, do we feel beneath that majestic Hand; yet Christ *wants* His Christians to look for and trust His gentle touch.

(2) Perhaps we may well re-read the epistle in the light of this gospel. The Epistle is a very strong injunction of St. Paul's that we should not return evil for evil; that we should be not only "prudent", provident, in our own regard, but "provide" good both towards God, and towards men: that we should live, so far as possible, in peace with all; that we should not defend ourselves, but yield place to anger, and hand over any vengeance to God. In short—we are undoubtedly to conquer evil, but by means of good.¹

¹ "If your enemy hungers feed him . . . for by so doing you will heap coals of fire upon his head." The phrase may puzzle us. The proceeding

Now either we do not listen to the Epistle at all ; or we may say : "But I haven't any enemies" (but we all have some people we dislike . . .) ; or we think that this is so much idealism and "not for me"—and take refuge in the thought that it is a "counsel" "merely" (terrible word, to use of *Our Lord's* "advice") ; or we may honestly sigh, and acknowledge "It's beyond me". But if we profess to *love* Our Lord, and see how He treated the leper, who was certainly a very repulsive-looking man, inspiring a sort of traditional disgust and terror, and reflect on how I hope He will treat *me*, then the Epistle becomes, please God, more "manageable" ! I pluck up courage, and in His Name, for His sake, after His model, I begin to "do what's impossible".

(3) The story of the Centurion is exquisite in many ways. (Unnecessary here to indicate the divergencies between St. Matthew and St. Luke [vii, 1-10 : cf. xiii, 28 and following] : from Our Lord's words it becomes clear that he was a pagan ; there is no indication that he was a proselyte. He appealed to Our Lord for his servant who lay sick "in terrible torment", and when Our Lord said He would come and cure him, answered in the words we know so well. (But in the Greek there is a delicate and pathetic touch. We should translate it : *ut meum sub tectum intres*—and in English : "shouldst enter into any house of *mine* !" So humble was he . . .) Then with incomparable naïvety he says that Our Lord only has to issue his orders . . . "For *I too* am a man—under authority indeed, but having soldiers under *me* ; and I say to the one : Go ! and he goes ; to another, Come ! and he comes ; to my servant, Do so and so—and he does it." "Do Thou do likewise !" Thus he felt that Our Lord was somehow superior to man, though under God, of course ; and that He could utter His commands to man's miseries ; the Illness is as it were personified. And Our Lord was, as we say, "lost in

would be uncomfortable, to say the least of it. We are told that it means that we shall arouse burning contrition within him. Possibly ; but that seems very far-fetched. The words are a quotation from Prov. xxv, 21, 22. The first two clauses are the same, but the words "for by so doing" are not there. Does not the last clause mean : "For *if* thou heap coals of fire upon his head, the Lord shall reward thee" (not quoted by St. Paul), i.e. punish thee in thy turn ? In the O.T., so far as "coals of fire" were used metaphorically, they seem always to imply fierce punishment inflicted by God or in His name. I find it hard to suppose that St. Paul made the words mean the exact opposite without any warning. . . .

admiration" at so much faith—simplicity and faith somehow go together—and then said what was worse, to his critics' ears, than even touching the leper had been : "Many shall come from east and west and feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of the Heavens : but the sons of the Kingdom [that is, those to whom by inheritance it should have belonged] shall be cast forth." No wonder if even the well-disposed were appalled by this complete inversion of the destinies of the Gentile and the Jew.

The Mass insists on the Epiphany of Christ to the Heathen. "The Lord hath enthroned Himself ; let the earth rejoice, and let the many isles be glad !" (Introit ; Alleluia-chant.) "The Heathen shall have awe of Thy Name, O Lord, and all the kings of the earth of Thy Glory !" (Grad.) "*All* marvelled at the Words that came forth from the mouth of God." (Communion.) The work is too great for us ? Courage ! God, who "freely grants us to make use of such mighty mysteries, will deign to make us *truly* apt for their effects." "I can do all things in Him who strengthens me !"

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.

"*Men marvelled.*" (Matt. viii, 27. Cf. Mark iv, 36-41. Lk. viii, 23-25.)

(1) The Stilling of the Storm. Jesus had entered the boat and was for crossing the Lake. He went to sleep, as St. Mark says, "in" the stern, i.e. in the little cabin aft, which many of the larger boats had. His head was on a cushion, adds St. Peter's secretary, to whom the Apostle must have related again and again what he remembered so vividly. Such little details, which make the story "live" for us, are not in the style of St. Matthew. The squall arose ; the ship was "smothered", as we say, with the waves ; the terrified disciples woke Him up, "Lord, save us, we perish !" and Our Lord still lying there, asked His question : "Why are you cowards, men of little faith ?" *Then* He rose, and rebuked the winds and the sea, "Silence ! be muzzled !" quotes St. Mark—and the great calm fell.

(2) There is no harm in our being allowed at times to experience, even painfully, the sense of our personal instability. "O God," says the Prayer, "who knowest that we, placed as we are amidst such dangers, because of our human frailty can find no foothold. . . ." And the Offertory Prayer repeats that word, "fragility". We like, at times, to seek back to the actual derivation of such a word, "brittleness"; we are very breakable people and certainly our "resolutions" are. . . . And how fond the Psalms are of that word "substantia"—*non est substantia*; there is nothing underneath to stand upon: a quicksand: one of those horrible "mires" which unfathomably engulf the unwary traveller. *Eduxisti me de lacu miseriae; posuisti pedes meos super firmam petram. . . .* I slip; *labitur humana mortalitas*, says the Missal elsewhere; but to slip and break one's bones is not so bad as that awful picture of being swallowed up in the smothering waters, let alone mire. We acknowledge all this, and turn to God and experience His rescue: "The right hand of the Lord hath worked mightily; the right hand of the Lord hath put me on my feet! I shall not die, but live, and relate the works of the Lord!" We may hope that when these lines are in print, the general state of the world will be less precarious than it is (August): we are, indeed, rather shocked by the nervousness displayed *especially* by educated people, even by those who are Catholic, though definitely less by them than by those who have neither faith nor hope and have not placed this life and this world in its only true perspective. But even if the war-scare should pass, and some hope of future security be once more reasonable, our country will still contain hundreds of thousands of men and women whose future is in no sense secure, and who always fear the morrow. Grim undertaking, to assess how much *fear* there is in the lives of so many of our fellow-countrymen. This is not an emotion usually experienced by us clergy, nor perhaps by the majority of those who come to our churches. For the panic-stricken are often too paralysed to come out at all. This terror about one's job, or its permanence; about the probability of being able to keep a roof, to feed a family; this carking anxiety and *uncertainty* are the result of social sin, and God forbid that we should share in it even by silence.

(
sligh
He
large
consi
it als
Holy
be a
gene
may
F
throu
Mag
paga
back
dent
ever
Chu
that
theo
are,
pred
that
read
'wor
puts
unha
sickn
to p
your
the C
direc
it ev
vari
whe
it, H
neig
Chr

¹ N
is nee

(3) *Narrabo opera Domini*. The Psalmist never had the slightest intention of keeping silence about God's rescue. He proposed to relate what God had done for him in the largest assembly he could find. The great Passion Psalm consists only in part of lamentation : as very nearly always, it also consists of loud praise because God has rescued His Holy One, and the Psalmist declares that not only will this be announced as publicly as possible, but so that future generations may know of it, and that a people yet unborn may give glory to the Lord.

Here at last we can concentrate on the notion prevailing throughout Epiphany-tide. The Star brought the heathen Magi to Bethlehem. We have to bring our contemporaries, pagan or not, to Jesus and Mary. We do not want to look back to the first Epiphany as to a distant, picturesque incident, but to re-create it, as the Passion and Resurrection ever are re-created, in the life of the Church, and of the Church in the actual world—*our* world. But how can I do that? I am no politician, financier, compelling writer, theorist, influential person of any kind! And those that are, do not seem to have done anything to cure the ills their predecessors have produced. Well, it is something to see that! And others are beginning to see it. They are readier to believe the Christian when he says he has the 'world-cure'. But *has* he? Yes; and No. If the pagan puts his happiness in the exact opposite of what makes him unhappy—riches instead of poverty; health instead of sickness—then the Christian has to say: "I am not here to provide you with wealth, or even health: I cannot build your earthly paradise or show you how to do it." *But*, if the Christian can show that the pagan is looking in the wrong direction for happiness, and that the Christian possesses it *even* though poor, sick, and distressed by "*mundi huius varietatibus*", simply because his heart is there "*fixed, where true joys are*"—if he can show *that*, and go on showing it, he will have gone a long way towards converting his neighbour and making a happy world. But what a Christian he must be! ¹

C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

¹ NOTE.—To-day (Nov.) the Country is at War: the Christian serenity is needed more than ever.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW

FR. H. JONE, O.M. Cap. follows his distinguished compatriot Prümmer in publishing a manual of Canon Law in addition to one on Moral Theology, but he prefers his native German to the use of Latin,¹ a practice which is becoming very common among German theologians and canonists. One may be permitted a comment on the fact that we are given, not merely a paraphrase, but a literal translation of each canon. It is well understood that special permission is required for printing a translation of the Code, and we have such specially authorized texts in the case of Lib. I, pars. ii, *De Religiosis*.² It is usually held that "Nemini liceat sine venia Sanctae Sedis hunc Codicem denuo imprimere aut in aliam linguam vertere", a notice printed on the first page of the Code, has the full force of law and is similar to the terms of Canon 1389 concerning the acts of the Roman Congregations. It will be remembered that the early volumes of Ayrinhac's commentary contained both the Latin original and an English version of the canons, but the practice was discontinued in the later volumes; also, a few years ago, a German version was expressly prohibited. It is evident that many canonical terms have a determined sense in the Latin words employed, and it might easily become lost in a vernacular version unless the greatest care is used. Fr. Jone meets the difficulty by occasionally inserting the Latin in brackets after a German word, but we think it would have been even better if the whole Latin text of each canon had been printed.

In the relatively small space given to the commentary, the author has succeeded in embodying all recent official decisions, as in Canon 522, and in noting the chief points of controversy. His sources and authorities are naturally German wherever they can be cited, but a liberal use is made of such well-known journals as *Periodica* and of the

¹ P. Heribert Jone O.M. Cap. Dr. iur. can., *Gesetzbuch des Kanonischen Rechtes*. I. Band, Normenrecht und Personenrecht. Ferdinand Schöningh, Paderborn, 1939, pp. 622.

² *Canonical Legislation concerning Religious*. Vatican Printing Office.

commentaries of Cappello, Coronata, and Vermeersch-Creusen.

It may unfortunately be a long time before Fr. Jone's succeeding volumes reach this country, even though the publication is not interrupted. The production of canonical works and periodicals is not favoured by the outbreak of war. Even so, it came as an unpleasant surprise to learn that our esteemed contemporary *l'Ami du Clergé* bowed before the storm so soon. A cheerful little announcement in the issue of 7 September explained that its publication would be suspended for the duration: "Au revoir, après la victoire!"

Bishop von Streng's pastoral instructions on marriage, widely read and welcomed in Germany, have been translated into English by Dr. Bruehl.¹ The Christian doctrine and ideal is admirably explained, the chief emphasis being placed on marriage as a state of marital happiness, the means of growing to the full stature of Christ. On several occasions during the last few years, in commenting upon books of this character, we have had to record that their authors were averse to giving wide publicity to what is known as the *Safe Period*. The Bishop does not, indeed, weigh the arguments for and against publicity and decide in its favour, but a favourable view is implied since his book is intended for the enlightenment of all married people and those contemplating marriage; it is meant to be a practical illustration of Canon 1033, which urges the pastoral clergy to instruct married people on their rights and duties.

He states on p. 102: "If married people have an ethically sound reason for restricting the number of children, they may do so by this method. The Encyclical of our Holy Father admits this in the following words: 'Nor are those considered as acting against nature who in the married state use their rights in the proper manner, although on account of natural reasons either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth.' The method itself is morally indifferent. It does nothing contrary to the nature of the marital act and it serves the secondary

¹ *Marriage, a Great Sacrament in Christ*. By the Most Rev. Franz von Streng, Bishop of Solothurn. Burns Oates & Washbourne. Pp. 128. 3s. 6d.

ends of marriage. . . . Morally indifferent in itself, this method can be vitiated by the ends for which it is used. If employed for selfish reasons it becomes sinful. Where suggested by selfishness, it will inevitably lead to moral deterioration and bring in its wake graver abuses. Well-intentioned married couples who under serious handicaps are earnestly striving to live up to the requirements of the moral law cannot be denied the knowledge of this expedient. Whilst the conscientious will use the information to solve their difficulties, the evil-minded will use it to their spiritual ruin."

This doctrine accurately represents the theological teaching on the subject. Attention is called to it because of the setting in which it is placed, namely, in a bishop's pastoral instruction to his flock. Since we have had to record, so far, that competent authority has been all on the side of reticence in communicating this doctrine to the faithful, it is right that an authoritative episcopal statement in an opposite direction should also be brought to the notice of our readers. A practical and logical consequence of this attitude would be to set up Catholic Birth Control Clinics for the purpose of teaching people the medical details about the Safe Period, and a persuasive plea for such bureaux may be read in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, September 1939.

In marked contrast to this view is the prohibition contained in n. 47 of the Vth Provincial Council of Malines: "Ob bonum sociale pastores animarum alique catholici viri a tali methodo habitualiter sequenda, data occasione populum Christianum avertant. Reprobandi sunt editores, scriptores et venditores librorum vel diarium qui ex professo istum usum in vulgus spargunt ac promovent." Weighing again the arguments, we find ourselves more than ever convinced that the Fathers of the Malines Council are right.

Assuming that they are right, children will continue to be born to Catholic parents, and the advice contained in a book such as De Greef's *Nos Enfants et Nous* will have more than a purely academic interest.¹ It deals with child psychology, the influence of environment on education, and the

¹ Dr. Etienne De Greef, *Nos Enfants et Nous*. Editions de la Cité Chrétienne. Pp. 209.

adaptation of a child's instincts and dispositions to its surroundings at various stages of growth. Of all the influences which affect a child's development, the family is, in normal circumstances, the most potent for good ; and by a family is meant not only the parents but numerous brothers and sisters. The subject is handled from a thoroughly Catholic point of view, and as far as we can judge its treatment is psychologically sound. Advocates of Catechism reform will find the chapter entitled *L'école et la première rencontre avec Dieu* of great interest.

The disadvantages of an exclusively institutional upbringing, which are implied in what Dr. de Greef has to say, are very prominent in the case of children of unmarried mothers. The familiar problem is discussed in a recent C.T.S. pamphlet.¹ The experienced author tells us, amongst other things, that it is generally agreed among those most intimately connected with rescue work that only in a very small percentage of cases is there evidence of lack of sexual knowledge. "One does not feel that, as a separate study, teaching of this kind should be given (in schools). The only approach to the subject which can be made safely without the danger of causing in sensitive young minds unhealthy curiosity or fear, with their consequent inhibitions, is as an integral part of religious instruction on the Sacraments. . . ." This admirably reflects the teaching of the Church on sex education as contained in the Encyclicals of Pius XI and in the Instruction of the Holy Office, 31 March, 1931, teaching which, we have often noticed with surprise, has escaped the attention of some Catholic educationalists.

In the collection *Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses*, the volumes devoted to the Sacraments are completed by M. de Clercq's description of Holy Orders, Marriage, and Extreme Unction.² The writer's acquaintance with the Eastern Churches has led him to give considerable information on these Sacraments as administered in the East. In fact, this book is more a liturgical and

¹ *The Unmarried Mother and Her Child*. By Mary Cunane, S.R.N. Catholic Truth Society. S. 142.

² C. de Clercq, *Ordre, Mariage, Extrême-Onction*. Bloud et Gay. Pp. 188. 15 frs.

historical study of the subject than an exposition of dogmatic and moral theology. *Casti Connubii* is wisely quoted throughout the treatise on marriage, but the author has not made the same use of the late Pope's Encyclical on the Priesthood in explaining Holy Orders. The first part of a useful commentary on this latter document has been published by Fr. Gennaro Gamboni, S.J.¹ in the form of Conferences to theological students.

Fr. F. M. Cappello, S.J., the eminent Gregorian professor, is probably the most widely quoted author who has written on the Sacraments since the publication of the Code. For completeness and attention to detail, both in solving moral problems and in explaining canon law, including its liturgical side, his manuals are in the first rank, and because of their popularity they are frequently re-edited—at a most reasonable price.² Apart from a general increase in size which accompanies the longevity of most theological manuals, as of some theologians, the most noticeable feature in the recent editions we have received is that the volume *De Matrimonio* is now split into two parts. Another improvement in Cappello's later work is the inclusion in each treatise of a section shortly explaining the law and practice of Eastern Christians. We have examined the contents of these volumes with some care, and have found that adequate mention is always made of recent decrees and developments. For example, the dispositions of *Lex Sacri Coelibatus*, 18 April, 1936, are included in the author's treatment of the censure attached to attempted marriage in Canon 2388; and, of course, the important Instruction of the *Congregation of the Sacraments*, 15 August, 1936, concerning the conduct of matrimonial causes in diocesan Curiae, enters closely into the appropriate section of *De Matrimonio*. Even the author's treatment of questions, which have received further official interpretation since these volumes went to press, will be found to have anticipated the doctrine of

¹ *L'Enciclica Ad Catholicos Sacerdotes*, Parte I, Sublimità e ministero del Sacerdozio Cattolico. Marietti. Pp. 245.

² *Tractatus Canonico Moralis De Sacramentis*, Vol. I, De Sacramentis in Genere—De Baptismo, Confirmatione et Eucharistia, Ed. 3a, 1938, Pp. 900, 35 lire; Vol. II, De Poenitentia, Ed. 3a, 1938, Pp. 940, 35 lire; Vol. III, pars 1 & 2, De Matrimonio, Ed. 4a, 1939, pp. 676 & 688, 50 lire. Marietti.

recent decrees in many respects ; we refer to such matters as the security of the tabernacle and the abuses to be avoided in the practice of frequent communion.

It is, perhaps, a matter for some little surprise that the theories on the primary purpose of marriage, as formulated by Dr. Doms, are not discussed as far as we can find, nor is his book included in the extensive bibliography. One reason may be that Dr. Doms is included in the note on page 9 (which is in previous editions of Fr. Cappello's work) amongst "certain authors" whose views are contested. Or it may be due to the emphasis placed on the canonical side of the treatise—*Tractatus Canonico-Moralis*. Dr. Doms's book has been much discussed in theological circles and an English translation has been published.¹

E. J. MAHONEY.

II. HISTORY

The story of the Papacy is one which has a special attraction for all students of history both Catholic and non-Catholic, and one which can be treated from widely differing points of view. Non-Catholics, though they may refuse to accept the Catholic position that the Papacy is a God-made institution founded for the purpose of preserving and protecting the Christian revelation, though they may, with Hobbes, speak of the mediaeval Papacy as "the ghost of the Roman Empire sitting crowned on the grave thereof", are, for all that, hard put to it to explain in a convincing fashion the process by which the Papacy achieved its unique position. Two recent publications have this problem, from different aspects, as their central theme.

The Vatican as a World Power by Dr. Joseph Bernhart² is an attempt to tell in a single volume not only the history of the Papacy but also a great deal of the whole immense story

¹ *The Meaning of Marriage*. Translated by George Sayer. Pp. 229. 7s. 6d. Sheed & Ward.

² Demy 8vo. Pp. vii + 456. Longmans. 15s. The book is an efficient translation by George N. Shuster of *Der Vatikan als Weltmacht* (Leipzig, 1935), which was itself an enlarged and emended edition of *Der Vatikan als Thron der Welt* originally published in 1930. It may be well to remark that the English edition has no Imprimatur.

of the Catholic Church. The book, though written by a Catholic, has had a mixed reception. It is more than an essay, yet far less than a documented historical study, and the publishers have chosen to call it "an historical interpretation", suggesting rightly that it contains much that is personal to the author. Dr. Bernhart seems to have written primarily for non-Catholic readers, and he tends to stress the occasions of doctrinal and disciplinary development in the Church's history rather than the central vital life of the Church out of which all the developments have had their source. In the earlier part of the book he seems to find a suggestive central theme in the theory of balance and poise. "The cosmos of the Catholic Church is a perfect co-ordination of antitheses which hover in constant tension, maintaining themselves and mutually softening one another." The focal point, the fulcrum as it were, is presumably the Papacy, though this idea is rather suggested than worked out. What seems to me to be unfortunate in this early part of the book is the underlying implication that the Church and the Papacy have risen and grown less from inherent vitality than as a resultant of these conflicting tensions. However, in an inspiring, concluding chapter entitled "Quo Vadis?" the author rectifies these impressions and writes a brilliant and moving defence of the Papacy. The book fails in another sense through being overloaded. Dr. Bernhart can write fine and moving prose, but his essay lacks balance, and a desire to omit nothing makes the style cumbersome. The need for compression, too, results in some startling statements which would require a good deal of qualification, while many remarks, chiefly incidental, are flatly inaccurate. To what extent these defects vitiate the book must be a matter of opinion. They will at least suggest caution, and prevent too ready agreement with many original, and in places captivating, pages.

A totally different type of book is *The Church Universal and the See of Rome*.¹ This is described by the author as "a study in the relations between the Episcopate and the Papacy up to the Schism between East and West", and is really a series of separate chapters dealing with different episodes in

¹ By Henry Edward Symonds, C.R., B.D. Demy 8vo. Pp. ix + 296. (Published for the Church Historical Society.) S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

the history of those relations. Dr. Symonds makes his own position perfectly clear. The Church is indefectible. Divine authority was vested in the Apostles and is now exercised by the universal episcopate. Rome is the centre of this authority, but not *jure divino*. "The Episcopate was one in essence and ideal. But this unity had its centre in the Apostolic See of Rome." Yet "this centre is not indeed of such necessity that all cut off from it are by that fact cut off from membership within the Church of Christ". In his attempt to defend this position on historical grounds the author examines not only cases of conflicting claims between individual bishops and the Papacy, but also the teaching of many of the Fathers. He candidly surrenders some of the antiquated Protestant positions, but in other respects one gathers the impression that in spite of his apparent objectivity he is pleading a cause rather than conducting a serious historical investigation. It is significant perhaps that in the survey of the New Testament texts Luke xxii, 31, 32 is entirely neglected, and throughout the book there are other similar omissions. St. Augustine's teaching, and, above all, his example, are interpreted somewhat arbitrarily in the author's sense. The claims of Pope Julius I in his letter to the Eusebians are minimized, while the later interpretations of the Greek historians Socrates and Sozomen are dismissed as "garbled versions". The inconvenient passage in the letter of the Council of Sardica to Pope Julius is treated as an interpolation; and even in the excellent account of the Greek schism where full use is made of the recent studies of Grumel and Dvornik, the point made by the latter that in the Photian quarrel both sides were working for the approval of the Roman See is conveniently neglected.

A third book deals with the Papacy on a much more straightforward plan.¹ Mr. Attwater's book is a chronological series of studies of all the Popes from St. Peter to the present Holy Father. At first sight it seems very similar to *A Chronicle of the Popes* by A. E. McKilliam published by Messrs. Bell in 1912, but a comparison brings out two striking differences. The older book was concerned principally with the political and secular activities of the

¹ *A Dictionary of the Popes*. By Donald Attwater. Demy 8vo. Pp. vi + 337. Burns Oates & Washbourne. 10s. 6d.

Popes, and it was, on the whole, a dull book to read. Mr. Attwater rightly points out that his book, as befits a Catholic work, concentrates more particularly on the religious and ecclesiastical interests of the Popes, and, he might have added, their spiritual significance as well. The style too is vastly different. Mr. Attwater writes a lively prose, and is not afraid to spice the record with his own remarks and criticisms, pungent at times, but usually much to the point. He has in fact achieved that remarkably difficult feat of writing a book of reference which can be read for its own sake.

M. Jean Guiraud, for years Professor of History in the University of Besançon is recognized as one of the greatest living authorities on the history of the Inquisition. His shorter study, *The Medieval Inquisition*, is well known in England, and a few years ago he published the first volume of what was clearly the fruit of a lifetime's study. A much larger second volume¹ has now appeared with the announcement that the third and concluding volume is in course of preparation. In the earlier volume the author dealt with the growth of the Albigensian and the Waldensian heresies and the early attempts to convert the heretics by preaching. He showed how this failed and how the Albigensian Crusade took form. In the present sturdy, well-printed and fully documented volume he covers a wider field. Nearly half the book deals with the growth of heresy outside France, in Spain and northern Italy, and treats very fully the background of political rivalry against which the heretical sects flourished. As always, vested interest and the desire for loot played their parts in determining allegiances, and as passions rose violence became inevitable. In unfavourable environment the sects took on the characteristics of secret societies, with not only secret propaganda but murder and assassination as their weapons, while in more favourable circumstances, under political protection, they went as far as wholesale massacre. It is an easy task for M. Guiraud to show what a real menace these sects were to

¹ *Histoire de l'Inquisition au Moyen Age. Tome I, Origines de l'Inquisition dans le Midi de la France, Cathares et Vaudois.* Pp. lxxviii + 425 (1936) 65 frs. *Tome II, L'Inquisition au XIII^e Siecle en France, en Espagne, en Italie.* Pp. viii + 626. 95 frs. Paris, Auguste Picard, 82 rue Bonaparte. The prices are pre-war.

Christian society, and how the appeal to force was almost inevitable. He shows very clearly how the religious question is inextricably mixed up with the politics of the day, and how impossible it is to discuss the Inquisition satisfactorily without taking full account of the whole political background and the social conditions of the time. The organization of the Inquisition in the three countries is examined, and the work of the great Inquisitors is carefully analysed without apology or mitigation. It is impossible in such short space to do justice to this book. When the third volume appears with its conclusion and full bibliography it is to be hoped that an English translation will speedily be undertaken. It would, however, be a wise thing to supply an index to each volume.

Two first-rate Irish biographies call for some remark. Mr. Gwynn's study of Henry Grattan¹ adds little that is new to the accepted view of the patriotic constitutionalist who revitalized the Irish Parliament and who unsuccessfully spent his life trying to fuse Irish Catholics and Protestants into a political unity within the limits of the British Constitution. But the book, relying largely on contemporary newspapers, gives a full and vivid picture of Grattan's age with the two conflicting elements he was striving to reconcile, and perhaps its greatest merit is that it reconstructs the mind and spirit of the landlords of the Protestant ascendancy not as Catholic historians have been tempted to represent them, but as they appeared to themselves. Even so the picture is not without its unsavoury side. To the Irish patriot Grattan was a failure because, having won so much in 1783, he refused to go further and opposed the efforts of Flood and the Volunteers. Yet he has a claim to the gratitude of all Catholics of every political persuasion for his unswerving advocacy of at least some measure of Catholic emancipation. Theobald Wolfe Tone was the very antithesis of Grattan in temperament, character and outlook, and in comparison with the austere somewhat rigid parliamentarian he scintillates brilliantly. He is the ideal subject for a biography, not merely because of his adventurous career and the tragedy of his death, but because he has left

¹ *Henry Grattan and his Times*. By Stephen Gwynn. Demy 8vo. Pp. viii + 402. Harrap & Co. 15s.
Vol. xvii.

such splendid and self-revealing records. Mr. MacDermot has risen to the height of his subject, and has written a remarkable fine book stamped with the mark not only of academic scholarship, but of deep and sincere thought.¹ His book will disappoint many who have idealized Tone as the greatest of all nationalists "without whom Republicanism in Ireland would virtually have no tradition". Mr. MacDermot is not without enthusiastic admiration for his hero, but wisely he sees deeper than the captivating personality of the young Republican, and soberly distrusts the ideas for which Tone stands. Around the central character his book is a study of the French Revolution, its effect on Ireland and on Irish thought, the growth and influence of revolutionary propaganda, and the opportunities provided by the fact that England became engaged in the long struggle of the revolutionary wars. Mr. MacDermot sees clearly the subversive character of the French Revolution, its attack on all order and authority as such, its insistence on human rights and convenient forgetfulness of human duties, with the seditious Masonic influence behind each fresh outrage on the rights of God and the just rights of man. He is cautious in his estimate of what Tone's success might have meant, though he agrees that his failure, with the resultant Union, paved the way for evils perhaps of different character, but certainly no less grave. He has wise words too on the necessity of domestic co-operation in Ireland, and his book as a whole is one which students on both sides of the Anglo-Irish question will receive with gratitude.

The late Edward Eyre's ambitious scheme for a survey of the history of European culture from the Catholic standpoint has at last reached full realization. The seven bulky and beautifully produced volumes contain a great deal of valuable and scholarly matter, but one may perhaps be permitted to doubt if the scheme has been entirely successful. It has tended to become submerged under an unwieldy accumulation of material, much of it extremely valuable, but a good deal irrelevant to the main purpose. These weaknesses—if they are weaknesses—are apparent in the

¹ *Theobald Wolfe Tone*. By Frank MacDermot. Demy 8vo. Pp. xv + 342. Macmillan & Co. 15s.

final volume of the collection.¹ Two contributions are outstanding—an authoritative account of European development in the Far East from the pen of Père Charles, and a very full study of the fate of the American Indians which will probably break much new ground for most readers in this country. A great deal of the matter in this volume might, however, have been found in any full history of colonial and imperial expansion, and it is a pity that the work of the Catholic Missions, though given due prominence, could not have been given even more generous treatment. To one reader at least the original aim of the whole has best been realized in Mr. Douglas Woodruff's introductory essay on *The European Frontier*.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

¹ *European Civilization Its Origin and Development*. By various Contributors. Vol. VII. *The Relations of Europe with Non-European Peoples*. Demy 8vo. Pp. vi + 1209, with twenty maps. Oxford University Press. 21s. The complete set is sold for £6 6s.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

THE TITULAR IN "A CUNCTIS" OF THE BREVIARY

The reply on this subject in *CLERGY REVIEW*, August 1939, p. 168, considered only the rubric of the Missal. A similar treatment of the question as affecting the *Suffragium* of the Breviary would be useful. (W.E.)

REPLY

The recent indult applies equally to the titular to be mentioned in this prayer of the Breviary, which is accompanied by a lengthy rubric on the same lines as that in the Missal. It supposes that the cleric is attached to the service of a church, and that he is normally reciting the office in the church to which he belongs, *ecclesia propria*. If actually, for any reason, he is not in his own church or its precincts when privately reciting the breviary, the titular to be mentioned is that of his own church. The rubric of the Missal also reads "titularis propriae ecclesiae", but "propriae" in this context is certainly to be understood of the titular of the church in which Mass is being said, not that of the church to which the celebrant belongs. This rule is established by several decrees, and it is part and parcel of the wider rule which requires Mass to be said according to the kalendar of the place where it is celebrated. The older clergy will remember that before the Pian reform of the Breviary, an imposing array of suffrages occurred on certain days. The new Breviary replaced these by assigning the *A cunctis* from the missal.

It would be too considerable a task to demonstrate the logicity of all rubrics relating to offices and kalendars; so many influences and reasons have contributed to their formation in the course of ages, and there are so many exceptions and conditions in them all. But there is a publicity about the Mass, demanding uniformity for all celebrated in the same church, which is not verified in the *private* recitation of office, even though, as we all know, it is still public prayer. It follows that a priest who is presiding at the public office in a church, not his own, mentions the titular of the church in which the office is being recited.

Following the arrangement adopted in our previous

reply, the rules for naming the titular in the suffrage of the Breviary may be stated as follows :

(i) A priest who is not attached to any church has no titular, and the words "atque Beato N" are simply omitted, unless he is following a lawful custom which permits the name of a local patron to be inserted instead.

(ii) The rule requiring mention of the titular is subject to the following exceptions :

(a) It is omitted if the titular is a Divine Person or a mystery connected with Our Lord.

(b) It is omitted likewise if the feast or vigil happens to be that of the titular or contains a commemoration of the same. An alternative form of suffrage is accordingly given when the office or a commemoration is of Our Lady. The principle is to avoid mentioning the same saint twice.

(c) For the same reason it is omitted if the name is already mentioned in the prayer.

(iii) The rules of precedence are the same as those given in our earlier reply referring to the *A cunctis* in the Mass. We can find no ruling on what should happen if two priests, ascribed to different churches, are reciting Office together. The titular mentioned may be that of the church to which the priest reciting the prayer belongs ; or it may be determined on rules of precedence ; or one may be inserted at Lauds and the other at Vespers ; or both may be inserted. Difficulties arise in order to be overcome : "Shall two walk together except they be agreed ?" (Amos III. 3.)

(iv) If the name of the titular is omitted, for any of the above reasons, it should not be replaced by another, e.g. that of the local patron, unless the practice is justified by a lawful custom. There is some dispute about the latter part of this statement. Some maintain that the rubric as it now stands, both in the Missal and in the Breviary : "*In hisce autem omnibus casibus omittuntur verba atque Beato N*", is explicit and makes no provision for custom ; it is later than the decrees S.R.C. which recognized the insertion of the name of the local patron ; accordingly the custom is no longer tolerated¹. Others, relying on the directions of

¹ Callewaert in *Collationes Brugenses*, 1926, p. 345 ; *Liturgicae Institutiones, De Brev. Rom. Liturgia*, 1939, p. 290.

S.R.C. which were quoted in our former reply, permit the insertion of whatever name is customary, particularly in the case of clerics not ascribed to any church.¹

We are of the opinion that a lawful custom of naming the patron is not abolished by the directions of the rubric which states the common law. In many other points of liturgical law, much more important than this, we have frequently found the force of custom sustained against the written law. In any case, as the writers are in disagreement, one is free to choose whatever solution is preferred, until the competent authority explicitly abolishes the custom.

E. J. M.

DOUBLE TITULAR IN "A CUNCTIS"

In a church dedicated to the Blessed Sacrament and St. Teresa, should the name of the second titular be mentioned in the Mass prayer *A cunctis*? (W.)

REPLY

From S.R.C. n. 3417.3 & 4055.3 a church may have more than one titular, and they each enjoy the privileges accorded by the rubrics, including a mention in the prayer *A cunctis*, unless they are to be omitted according to the rules already outlined in this REVIEW, August, 1939, p. 169. Thus, if the titular is "Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary" neither is mentioned; if it is "SS John Fisher and Thomas More" both are mentioned; if it is "Our Lady and St. Edward" the latter alone is mentioned. In the above instance the correct procedure is to insert at "N" the words "atque beata Teresia".

E. J. M.

BENEDICTION PRAYERS DURING OCTAVE OF CORPUS CHRISTI

A ruling of S.R.C. is quoted in some books to the effect that, during the Octave of Corpus Christi, no prayers except those addressed to Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament may

¹ Hebert, *Le Breviaire*, 1935, p. 210; Pauwels in *Periodica*, XXII, 1933 p. 216.

be said before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. Is this still the law, and should one accordingly omit the prayer to Our Lady for the Conversion of England? (K.)

REPLY

(i) The rule is no longer, we think, the common liturgical law throughout the Church. Certain older authors used to teach that it was more fitting to exclude all other prayers during the Octave of Corpus Christi,¹ and S.R.C., 23 Nov. 1906 ad XI adopted this rule: "An in functione Benedictionis SS. Sacramenti, praeter orationem de eodem, alia cantari possit? Resp. *Affirmative*, priusquam cantetur *Tantum Ergo*, quando aliae dicendae sunt preces. *Negative* in casu opposito, necnon in festo et infra Octavam SS. Corporis Christi."² But when this series of answers under the date of 23 November 1906 appeared in *Decreta Authentica* n. 4195, published in 1912, the exception previously made for Corpus Christi and its Octave was omitted, and the answer to the question ad X (not XI) is "Affirmative . . . preces. *Negative*, nisi aliter Apostolica Auctoritate statutum fuerit". One commentator on the authentic form of the decree writes: "Haec prohibitio canendi in laudibus vespertinis orationem B.V.M., in festo et infra Octavam SS. Corporis Christi sat singularis videbatur et certe contra usum in nostris regionibus acceptum. Nihil mirum proinde si fuerit sublata."³

(ii) Either relying on local custom, or because the liturgists who had heard of the decree only in its original unauthentic form continue to abide by it, the local law at present in many places preserves the original ruling of S.R.C. It is given, for example, in our *Ritus Servandus*, p. 14, and diocesan *Ordos* occasionally insert a reminder with a reference to the *Ritus Servandus*. We think that, on general principles, one must obey the local law of the *Ordo* and the *Ritus Servandus* in places where they are obligatory, unless Ordinaries issue directions to observe the common law.

E. J. M.

¹ E.g. Haegy, *Cérémonial*, 1902.

² *Periodica*, III, p. 32.

³ *Periodica*, vii, p. 32.

NUPTIAL BLESSING

May (1) a widow (2) a widower have a nuptial Mass for the second wedding, having already had one before? (J.H.)

REPLY

(i) The *common liturgical law* of the Church concerning nuptial Mass and blessing is contained in Canons 1101, 1102 §2, 1108 and 1143 of the Code ; in the rubrics nn. 16-19 of the Roman Ritual, Tit. vii, cap. 1, reformed in the current 1925 typical edition according to the prescriptions of the Code ; in the Roman Missal "*Missa Votiva Pro Sponso et Sponsa*" and in "*Addit. et Variat. in Rubr. Missalis*" II, n. 2 ; finally, in various decisions of the Congregation of Rites.

A "nuptial Mass" means either a votive Mass "*pro sponso et sponsa*", or on days when the rubrics forbid a votive Mass it means the Mass of the day with commemorations taken from the votive Mass. In this twofold sense of "nuptial Mass" the principle is that Mass and blessing are so united that it is not permitted to have one without the other.

Nuptial Mass and blessing are forbidden on All Soul's Day ; during the closed times of Advent and Lent, except with the permission of the Ordinary ; in mixed marriages ; and when the parties have already received the blessing in a previous marriage. The latter provision needs further explanation : if a spinster is marrying a widower who has already received the blessing, nuptial Mass and blessing are permitted only in places which have the custom, as in England. Cf. *Ordo Administrandi*, Tit. vii, cap. i, n. 16. If a widow is marrying again, nuptial Mass and blessing are permitted only if she had not received it at her first wedding. The notion is that, once the blessing has been given, it remains, and to repeat it would be useless ; but special favour is shown towards a woman who has never received it, since it is chiefly, though not exclusively, for her benefit.

If, for any of the reasons above mentioned, nuptial Mass

and blessing are forbidden, the marriage rite between two Catholics may always be followed by a Mass of the day or a votive Mass, when rubrically permitted, excepting always the votive Mass, "Pro Sponso et Sponsa". In mixed marriages, the Code Commission, 10 November, 1925, interpreting Canon 1102 §2, prohibits *any* Mass if it might be regarded, in the circumstances, as a part or complement of the marriage rite.

(ii) *Particular indults and legitimate local customs* may modify very considerably the common law as briefly explained above. The Roman Ritual in the Appendix *De Matrimonio* contains two formulae which may be used by those who have obtained the papal indult. The first is a form of nuptial blessing to be used when Mass is not said; the second is a form of blessing to be used when both parties are Catholics but the nuptial blessing forbidden, e.g. because of closed time or because it has already been received. Both forms are contained in our English *Ordo Administrandi*, since this country has obtained the necessary indult.

Our correspondent states that certain rituals direct the prayer "Praetende, quaesumus", which concludes the second formula, to be used after the *Pater Noster* in place of the blessing in the Missal. We can find no mention of this practice in any of the sources at our disposal. The ritual is, no doubt, a local one which preserves a lawful custom, as provided for in Canon 5 of the Code. It is not the common law, nor is it contained in our own *Ordo Administrandi*. It would be unlawful to use it in places where the custom does not exist.

E. J. M.

MARRIAGE CAUSES

References have occasionally been made in the CLERGY REVIEW to manuals which explain, from a practical point of view, the procedure in marriage cases which come before the diocesan tribunal. It would be convenient if the information, which is now difficult to trace, could be repeated and supplemented with special reference to sources in English. (R.S.)

REPLY

(i) The one essential document is the Instruction of the *Congregation of the Sacraments*, 15 August, 1936, published in *A.A.S.*, XXVIII, 1936, pp. 313-72, entitled "Instructio servanda a tribunalibus dioecesanis in pertractandis causibus de nullitate matrimoniorum". Commentaries on this document appeared, at the time, in the canonical journals. Dr. J. Torre, an advocate of the Rota, has published one in Latin, which is obtainable from M. D'Auria, S. Sedis Apostolicae Typographus, Naples, 15 lire.

The articles of this Instruction, faced on opposite pages by an English version, form the substance of Dr. Doheny's *Practical Manual for Marriage Cases*, Bruce Publishing Company, New York, 1937. The ground is covered also by the same writer's *Canonical Procedure in Matrimonial Cases*. These two books, costing ten dollars, written by a practical canonist who is an advocate of the Rota, are quite the best obtainable on the subject, in our view, and the first-mentioned includes a number of *formulae*.

(ii) The rules to be observed in processes concerning the non-consummation of marriage were issued by the *Congregation of the Sacraments*, 7 May, 1923, *A.A.S.*, XV, 1923, pp. 392-413, supplemented by a further document, 27 March, 1929, which is given as Appendix I to the Instruction of 15 August, 1936. An English version of both is given by Woywood, *Canonical Decisions of the Holy See*, 1933, J. Wagner, New York. Appendix XXI of this book, after printing the texts, contains a series of *formulae* for these processes, many of which are in English.

(iii) A specimen series of acts illustrating the course of a trial may be seen in Part iii of Dr. Benedetti's *Ordo Iudicialis Processus Canonici*, Marietti, 1938. The recent edition of this work contains a commentary on the *Instructions* of 15 August, 1936, and 7 May, 1923, together with the *formulae* to be used in processes concerning the non-consummation of marriage.

Similar specimens are given by Canon Lanier, the Vice-Official of Paris, in his *Guide Pratique de la Procédure Matrimoniale*, Téqui, 1927; also by d'Angelo in *La Curia*

Diocesana, P. Lisi, Giarre, Sicily, 1928. But neither of these books has, we believe, been reissued since 1936, and works of this character dating from before the Instruction of 15 August, 1936, must be used with caution.

(iv) In drawing up the judgement of the Court, a few of the recently published volumes *Decisiones S. Romanae Rotae*, Libreria Vaticana, will provide ample material. The grounds upon which a marriage is assailed : fear, immoral conditions *contra substantiam matrimonii*, lack of canonical form, etc., are constantly recurring, and the Rota judgement *quoad jus*, often also *quoad factum*, can easily be adapted to composing a judgement for the case in hand. It is the rule not to publish these decisions of the Rota until ten years have elapsed, and the one most recently published is Vol. XXII, containing the cases for the year 1930. But it is clear that more recent judgements than these are obtainable, not only by the parties interested but by others. Dr. Hollnsteiner's *Die Spruchpraxis der S. Roman Rota in Ehenichtigkeitprozessen*, Bresgau, 1934, is a useful analysis of these documents, even for those with only a slight knowledge of German, since the texts cited are in Latin. Also extremely useful, as an Index of the more recently published volumes, is Bouscaren's *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. II, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1937. Under the appropriate canons of the Codex a summarized reference is given to over 200 Rota judgements. The *Normae S. Romanae Rotae Tribunalis*, A.A.S., XXVI, 1934, pp. 449-92, have often been adapted to the use of diocesan tribunals, e.g. *Jus Pontificium* 1934, Vol. XIV, p. 305, but such studies are of small utility since the Instruction 15 August, 1936.

(v) A more detailed account of the duties of persons functioning in the diocesan tribunal may be seen in Dr. Tobin's *De Officiali Curiae Dioecesanae*, Gregorian University, Rome, 1936; or in Dr. Glynn's *The Promotor of Justice*, Catholic University of America, Washington, 1936. Both are theses for the Doctorate in Canon Law, and the list of Washington theses contains a number of other commentaries dealing with this subject, e.g. : Lyons, *The Collegiate Tribunal of First Instance*, 1932; Kealy, *The Introductory Libellus in Church Court Procedure*.

E.J.M.

ERECTING STATIONS OF THE CROSS

Since it is understood that the regulations have recently been modified considerably, would you state what formalities are now necessary for the valid erection of the Stations of the Cross in a new (secular) parish church? (W.S.)

REPLY

In order that the Indulgences attached to the Stations may be obtained it has always been necessary (1) to enjoy the requisite faculties of erection, (2) to use a lawful form of blessing, which includes the blessing of the *wooden* crosses. There is no particular difficulty about the latter condition, and it is usually held that the general *Sanatio* given from time to time by the Holy See refers only to defects in the former condition, namely, the faculties of erection.

Until 12 March, 1938, the consent or delegation of various people was required under pain of nullity: a faculty from the Holy See or from the Franciscans (Friars Minor); the permission of the local Ordinary; the consent of the rector or religious authority of the Church. Usually a printed formula containing these documents on one sheet was employed, since it was also necessary for validity that the various faculties, etc., should be in writing.

In order to facilitate the erection of Stations and minimize the risk of invalidity, the *Sacred Penitentiary*, 20 March, 1938,¹ simplified the procedure, declaring: "abrogatis singulis conditionibus hactenus vigentibus, benigne decernere dignatus est ad validam stationum 'Viae Crucis' erectionem sufficere ut sacerdos, idcirco rogatus, debita facultate sit praeditus, iuxta Decretum 'Consilium suum persequens' datum die 12 (20) Martii, 1933". As far as the validity of the act is concerned, the only necessary preliminary is to have obtained the faculty of erection, which some ecclesiastics possess by the common law and others must obtain by delegation. The use of the prescribed

¹ CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XIV, 1938, p. 550.

form, and particularly the necessity of having wooden crosses, are in no way changed by this decree.¹

The people most seriously affected are the Friars Minor. Since 20 March, 1933, a decree which is recalled in last year's document, the faculty which they used to enjoy of delegating *any* priest to erect the Stations has been withdrawn, and their power in this respect is restricted to their own preachers and confessors.

Cardinals, from canon 239 §1, n. 6, possess the faculty, which also entitles them to erect Stations "sub unica benedictione", that is to say, without using the formula in the *Rituale Romanum*.

All bishops, including titular bishops, also have the faculty, from canon 349 §1, n. 1: "ritibus tamen ab Ecclesia praescriptis", that is to say, they must use the form in the *Rituale Romanum*, Benedictiones Propriae, n. 1, and the use of this form is *a fortiori* obligatory on all others who obtain a delegated faculty. The Vicar-General does not enjoy the faculty, nor may bishops delegate their powers even *per modum actus*.²

The major superiors and local superiors of the Friars Minor, by an ancient privilege, enjoy the faculty, and priests of the Order may obtain delegated faculties from their superiors.

All other priests must obtain the faculty from the Holy Sec. Bishops may not, indeed, by the common law, delegate their priests, but the power to do so is often obtained. It is included, for example, in the faculties granted by Propaganda.³

The new decree says nothing about the necessity of delegation being in writing, and we may conclude that it is no longer absolutely necessary for the validity of the act. This is, at least, the official view taken by the authorities of the Franciscans: "Delegatio tamen, quae fieri potest a Superioribus Ordinis nostri erga proprios subditos, quando ipsi personaliter facultate hac uti nolunt, non amplius requiritur ut sit in scriptis data ad validitatem delegationis et subsequentis erectionis; cum nec ullibi in Codice, nec

¹ Cf. CLERGY REVIEW, Vol. XII, 1936, p. 409.

² S. Penit., 10 November, 1926.

³ Vromant, *Facultates Apostolicae*, 1938, n. 122.

in citato decreto S. Poenitentiariae hoc praecipitur.”¹ Nevertheless, for the lawful erection of Stations, delegation should be in writing, and likewise the act of erection should be recorded in writing, in order to establish these facts beyond all doubt.

The written approval of the local Ordinary, formerly required for validity, is now required as a proper measure of order and discipline. As the recent decree states: “prorsus tamen decere, ratione praesertim ecclesiasticae disciplinae, ut singulis vicibus, nisi agatur de locis exemptis, accedat venia Ordinarii loci, ubi facultas exercetur, saltem rationabiliter praesumpta, quando Ordinarius facile adiri nequeat”.

The rector of a secular Church may, accordingly, seek the faculty himself from the Holy See through the Ordinary, or permit the act of erection to be performed by a Franciscan delegated by his superiors. Nothing more is required for validity. To be lawful, the Ordinary's permission should also be obtained, and a document should be drawn up, signed and dated, containing the delegation, the Ordinary's permission and a record of the fact of erection.

E.J.M.

¹ *Acta Ordinis Minorum*, LVII, 1938, pp. 206-7, quoted in *Collectanea Mechlinensia*, 1938, p. 266.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

(i) NUNTIVS RADIOPHONICVS. *A Beatissimo Patre, die xxiv mensis Augusti anno mcmxxxix, universo terrarum orbi datus* (A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 333).

Un'ora grave suona nuovamente per la grande famiglia umana ; ora di tremende deliberazioni, delle quali non può disinteressarsi il Nostro cuore, non deve disinteressarsi la Nostra Autorità spirituale, che da Dio Ci viene, per condurre gli animi sulle vie della giustizia e della pace.

Ed ecco Ci con voi tutti, che in questo momento portate il peso di tanta responsabilità, perchè a traverso la Nostra ascoltiate la voce di quel Cristo da cui il mondo ebbe alta scuola di vita e nel quale milioni e milioni di anime ripongono la loro fiducia in un frangente in cui solo la sua parola può signoreggiare tutti i rumori della terra.

Ecco Ci con voi, condottieri di popoli, uomini della politica e delle armi, scrittori, oratori della radio e della tribuna, e quanti altri avete autorità sul pensiero e l'azione dei fratelli, responsabilità delle loro sorti.

Noi, non d'altro armati che della parola di Verità, al disopra delle pubbliche competizioni e passioni, vi parliamo nel nome di Dio, da cui ogni paternità in cielo ed in terra prende nome (*Eph.* 3, 15)—di Gesù Cristo, Signore Nostro, che tutti gli uomini ha voluto fratelli—dello Spirito Santo, dono di Dio altissimo, fonte inesaurita di amore nei cuori.

Oggi che, nonostante le Nostre ripetute esortazioni e il Nostro particolare interessamento, più assillanti si fanno i timori di un sanguinoso conflitto internazionale ; oggi che la tensione degli spiriti sembra giunta a tal segno da far giudicare imminente lo scatenarsi del tremendo turbine della guerra, rivolgiamo con animo paterno un nuovo e più caldo appello ai Governanti e ai popoli : a quelli, perchè, deposte le accuse, le minacce, le cause della reciproca diffidenza, tentino di risolvere le attuali divergenze coll'unico mezzo a ciò adatto, cioè con comuni e leali intese : a questi, perchè, nella calma e nella serenità, senza incomposte agitazioni, incoraggino i tentativi pacifici di chi li governa.

È con la forza della ragione, non con quella delle armi,

che la Giustizia si fa strada. E gl'imperi non fondati sulla Giustizia non sono benedetti da Dio. La politica emancipata dalla morale tradisce quelli stessi che così la vogliono.

Imminente è il pericolo, ma è ancora tempo.

Nulla è perduto con la pace. Tutto può esserlo con la guerra. Ritornino gli uomini a comprendersi. Riprendano a trattare. Trattando con buona volontà e con rispetto dei reciproci diritti si accorgeranno che ai sinceri e fattivi negoziati non è mai precluso un onorevole successo.

E si sentiranno grandi—della vera grandezza—se imponendo silenzio alle voci della passione, sia collettiva che privata, e lasciando alla ragione il suo impero, avranno risparmiato il sangue dei fratelli e alla patria rovine.

Faccia l'Onnipotente che la voce di questo Padre della famiglia cristiana, di questo Servo dei servi, che di Gesù Cristo porta, indegnamente sì, ma realmente tra gli uomini, la persona, la parola, l'autorità, trovi nelle menti e nei cuori pronta e volenterosa accoglienza.

Ci ascoltino i forti, per non diventar deboli nella ingiustizia. Ci ascoltino i potenti, se vogliono che la loro potenza sia non distruzione, ma sostegno per i popoli e tutela a tranquillità nell'ordine e nel lavoro.

Noi li supplichiamo per il sangue di Cristo, la cui forza vincitrice del mondo fu la mansuetudine nella vita e nella morte. E supplicandoli, sappiamo e sentiamo di aver con Noi tutti i retti di cuore; tutti quelli che hanno fame e sete di Giustizia—tutti quelli che soffrono già, per i mali della vita, ogni dolore. Abbiamo con Noi il cuore delle madri, che batte col Nostro; i padri, che dovrebbero abbandonare le loro famiglie; gli umili, che lavorano e non sanno; gli innocenti, su cui pesa la tremenda minaccia; i giovani, cavalieri generosi dei più puri e nobili ideali. Ed è con Noi l'anima di questa vecchia Europa, che fu opera della fede e del genio cristiano. Con Noi l'umanità intera, che aspetta giustizia, pane, libertà, non ferro che uccide e distrugge. Con Noi quel Cristo, che dell'amore fraterno ha fatto il suo comandamento, fondamentale, solenne; la sostanza della sua Religione, la promessa della salute per gli individui e per le Nazioni.

Memori infine che le umane industrie a nulla valgono senza il divino aiuto, invitiamo tutti a volgere lo sguardo in

Alto ed a chiedere con fervide preci al Signore che la sua grazia discenda abbondante su questo mondo sconvolto, plachi le ire, riconcili gli animi e faccia risplendere l'alba di un più sereno avvenire. In questa attesa e con questa speranza impartiamo a tutti di cuore la Nostra paterna Benedizione.

Benedictio Dei Omnipotentis Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti descendat super vos et maneat semper.

(ii) HORTATIO. *A Summo Pontifice, die xxxi mensis Augusti anno mcmxxxix, ad gubernia Angliae, Galliae, Germaniae, Italiae et Poloniae missa* (A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 335).

Le Souverain Pontife ne veut pas renoncer à l'espoir que les négociations en cours puissent aboutir à une solution juste et pacifique, telle que le monde entier ne cesse de l'implorer.

Sa Sainteté supplie, par conséquent, au nom de Dieu, les Gouvernements d'Allemagne et de Pologne de faire ce qui leur est possible afin d'éviter tout incident, et de s'abstenir de prendre toute mesure susceptible d'aggraver la tension actuelle. Elle prie les Gouvernements d'Angleterre, de France et d'Italie d'appuyer sa demande.

These two documents are contained in an English version, amongst the papers printed in the Blue Book Cmd. 6106 under n. 139 and 141 respectively. (H.M. Stationery Office. 1s.) On the Holy Father's broadcast, Viscount Halifax telegraphed to Mr. Osborne at 5.15 p.m., 25 August, the following message :

"Please inform the Cardinal Secretary of State, or if it is practicable the Pope himself, that His Majesty's Government have much appreciated the moving and dignified appeal for peace which His Holiness broadcast to the world last night.

"In my own broadcast yesterday evening, I referred to the Pope's message, but I should wish His Holiness to know in a more direct manner of the response which his words have evoked in the hearts and minds not only of His Majesty's Government, but of the people of this country as a whole." (*Blue Book*, n. 140.)

Vol. xvii.

The further appeal of His Holiness was conveyed through Mr. Osborne to Viscount Halifax, and copies were handed also to the Ambassadors of Germany, Poland, France and Italy ; also to the Spanish Ambassador and to the United States Ambassador to the Quirinal. In reference to this communication the following note was sent at 10 p.m. on 31 August from Viscount Halifax to the British Ambassadors in Berlin and Warsaw :

"Please make following communication to German/Polish Government : His Majesty's Government have been informed of the Pope's appeal to your Government to do all that is in their power to avoid any incident and to abstain from taking any steps that might aggravate the present tension. His Majesty's Government desire to support this appeal with all the earnestness at their command." (*Blue Book*, n.142.)

E. J. M.

(iii) *Beatissimus Pater, die 14 mensis Septembris 1939, nobilissimis verbis, quibus Exc^{ms} Vir Hadrianus Nieuwenhuys qua Legatus Belgicae Nationis Litteras publicas porrexit, haec respondit (A.A.S. xxxi, 1939, p. 367).*

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur,

C'est une vive satisfaction pour Nous de recevoir des mains de Votre Excellence les Lettres par lesquelles Sa Majesté le Roi des Belges L'accrédite auprès de Nous comme Son Ambassadeur Extraordinaire et Plénipotentiaire. Nous voyons dans ces Lettres une expression nouvelle de l'intérêt particulier que Votre Auguste Souverain attache au maintien des étroites et confiantes relations unissant heureusement la Nation Belge à ce Siège Apostolique : relations qui tournent à l'avantage tout ensemble de l'Eglise et de l'Etat. Les paroles, dont Votre Excellence a accompagné cet acte solennel, sont pour Nous une garantie (Nous l'attendions avec pleine certitude, mais Nous n'en sommes pas moins touché), que les intentions élevées de Sa Majesté trouveront en Vous la plus entière et la plus fidèle correspondance. En retour, soyez assuré, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, que Nous, qui voici bien des années déjà avons eu l'occasion de connaître et d'apprécier vos belles qualités d'esprit et de

cœur, Nous Vous donnerons bien volontiers tout Notre appui, dans l'accomplissement de la haute tâche qui Vous est confiée.

Les débuts de cette mission coïncident avec une heure de tension tragique, qui emplit Notre cœur d'une profonde tristesse. Ce qui, depuis le dernier conflit mondial, était l'angoisse et la terreur des peuples, est à nouveau une réalité,—la réalité d'une catastrophe incommensurable ! Car cette guerre nouvelle, qui déjà ébranle le sol de l'Europe, et particulièrement celui d'une Nation catholique, aucune prévision humaine ne peut calculer ni quel effroyable potentiel de carnage elle porte en elle, ni quelles seront son extension et ses complications successives.—Votre Excellence rappelle à bon droit les efforts accomplis par Son Souverain, jusqu'à la dernière minute, pour sauver la paix menacée et pour préserver les peuples d'Europe des plus graves calamités. Mais, qui donc pouvait être plus ardemment disposé à aider ces généreuses tentatives, que le Père commun de la Chrétienté ? Placé, par les devoirs de Notre ministère apostolique, au-dessus des conflits particuliers,—et soucieux, dans Notre sollicitude paternelle, du vrai bien de tous les peuples, Nous voyions, avec un douloureux serrement de cœur, s'approcher de jour en jour le cataclysme qui suivrait, comme une conséquence inéluctable, l'abandon du principe des négociations et le recours à la force des armes.—Nous n'avons pas à redire Nous-même comment la prévision d'un si grand malheur Nous a accompagné sans cesse, depuis le premier jour de Notre Pontificat ;—comment, jusqu'à l'instant suprême qui précéda l'explosion des hostilités, Nous n'avons rien omis, de ce que Nous pouvions tenter,—soit par des prières et des exhortations publiques, soit par des démarches confidentielles, réitérées et précises,—pour éclairer les esprits sur la gravité du péril, et pour les amener à de loyales et pacifiques négociations, sur les bases, les seules solides et durables, de la justice et de l'amour : justice rendue au plus faible non moins qu'au plus fort ; amour qui se maintienne à l'abri des égarements de l'égoïsme, de sorte que la sauvegarde du droit de chacun ne dégénère pas en oubli, ou négation, ou violation positive, du droit des autres.

Aujourd'hui malheureusement le grondement du canon,

le tumulte des armées combattantes et la rapide succession des faits de guerre sont sur le point de couvrir toutes les autres voix. Les hostilités déjà engagées, dans certains secteurs avec des effets foudroyants, semblent actuellement barrer aux champions de la paix les routes qui, hier encore, pouvaient paraître accessibles à une bonne volonté réciproque. Dans un tel état de choses, Nous élevons Nos prières vers Dieu, qui tient dans sa main les cœurs des hommes, afin qu'il abrège les jours de l'épreuve, et qu'il ouvre aux peuples, menacés de malheurs indicibles, des voies nouvelles vers la paix, avant que l'incendie actuel ne soit transformé en conflagration universelle.

Puisque Nous sommes, bien qu'indigne, le Vicaire de Celui qui est descendu sur la terre comme le *Princeps Pacis* ;— Nous sentant soutenu en outre par les prières des fidèles et conforté par l'intime certitude d'avoir avec Nous d'innombrables âmes de bonne volonté,—Nous ne cesserons pas d'épier attentivement, pour les seconder de tout Notre pouvoir, les occasions qui s'offriraient : avant tout, d'acheminer à nouveau les peuples, aujourd'hui soulevés et divisés, vers la conclusion d'une paix honorable pour tous, en conformité avec la conscience humaine et chrétienne, une paix, qui protège les droits vitaux de chacun et qui sauvegarde la sécurité et la tranquillité des Nations ;—et puis, tant que cela n'est pas possible, tout au moins de soulager les terribles blessures déjà infligées ou celles qui le seront dans l'avenir.—A ce propos, il Nous plaît de rappeler certaines déclarations, par lesquelles les Puissances belligérantes au commencement du conflit ont publiquement affirmé leur volonté d'observer, dans la conduite de la guerre, les lois de l'humanité et de se conformer aux stipulations des accords internationaux. Nous voulons donc espérer d'une manière spéciale, que les populations civiles seront préservées de toute opération militaire directe ; que, dans les territoires occupés, seront respectés la vie, la propriété, l'honneur et les sentiments religieux des habitants ; que les prisonniers de guerre seront traités humainement et pourront sans obstacles recevoir les réconforts de la religion ; que sera exclu l'usage des gaz asphyxiants et toxiques.

Chez un peuple, qui a donné à l'Eglise de si admirables

héros
appel
les rel
attenti
mains
Nous
Sa Ma
Gouve
partic
afin q

(iv
I.
vel Cu
vel Cu
vel Cu
vel Ca
Urban
uerun
neque
Pio P
seu "E
II.
human
tori c
del V
immu
in sua
Apost

héros de charité chrétienne, Nous sommes sûr que Notre appel pour la paix du Christ, pour la justice et la charité dans les relations internationales, trouvera toujours des esprits attentifs et bien disposés, des cœurs prêts au sacrifice, des mains secourables. Animé de cette consolante confiance, Nous invoquons la toute-puissante protection de Dieu sur Sa Majesté le Roi et sur toute la Famille Royale ; sur le Gouvernement et la Nation Belge ; et Nous implorons en particulier les bénédictions divines sur Votre Excellence, afin qu'elles L'accompagnent au cours de Sa haute mission.

(iv) *Monita* (Adnexum ad A.A.S. n. 11, 1939).

I. Quotquot—vel Cubicularii secreti supra numerum, vel Cubicularii secreti ab ense et lacerna supra numerum, vel Cubicularii honoris, vel Cubicularii honoris extra Urbem, vel Cubicularii honoris ab ense et lacerna supra numerum, vel Cappellani secreti honoris, vel Cappellani honoris extra Urbem—sub Pontificatu Pii Papae XI v. m. renunciati fuerunt, in "Annuario Pontificio" pro anno 1940 recensiri nequeunt, nisi singuli antea a regnante Summo Pontifice Pio Papa XII confirmati fuerint ac nuntium personalem seu "Biglietto di nomina" receperint.

II. Vehementer Exc.mi Ordinarii rogantur ut pro sua humanitate ante diem 5 proximi Novembris mensis Moderatori commentarii cui titulus "Annuario Pontificio (Città del Vaticano)" ea omnia significare velint, quae ipsis immutanda videantur quod ad indicem spectat eorum qui in sua cuiusque Dioecesi aliquo sunt honore ornati ab Apostolica Sede collato.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

CHURCH COLLECTIONS

IN the list of provisions for the maintenance of the clergy and the church which according to the decrees of the First Provincial Council are to be regarded as bona Ecclesiae, the second place is given to the collections that are made at the Offertory.

The first charge on these collections is the support of the pastors. Studied from this point of view the system is an abnormal one, or better, a provisional one which goes on indefinitely. The norm would be a scheme of established benefices, not, however, one dependent upon the much abused tithe after the mediaeval model.

But our forefathers of the middle ages did not escape from collections, or, as they were commonly called, "gaderyngs". Regular collections were made for the upkeep of the fabric, and others occasionally for specific purposes. At Hythe in Kent a collection was made at the church every Sunday. Even our irksome outdoor collection had its counterpart : in the parish of St. Dunstan's, Canterbury, nine brethren representing pious guilds did a weekly round.

With us, as in other countries where the Church is not state-aided and there are few endowed parishes, the Sunday collections continue to be the main line of support. It is desirable that the faithful should be taught to take an intelligent and gracious interest in collections, without having to be everlastingly subjected to naggings and complainings. The church suffers when the shepherd acquires the reputation of being a sheepdog.

We English Catholics unblushingly prefer the brazen plate to the genteel and discreet bag. The collector's office is an honourable one, and should be entrusted only to men good and true, of tried integrity and well known in the parish. As, however, there are few parishes even amongst those which appear to be regulated to a point of proof against imperfections, that have not at some time or other had a painful experience of peculation, it is advisable for the safeguarding both of the plate and of the reputation of the collector to take proper precautions. It is unwise to

allow any lay individual to have the regular handling of the contributions of the faithful. The collectors should be instructed never to take the collections to the sacristy and leave them there, but in full view of the congregation to deposit them in some suitable place within the sanctuary. A practical method of introducing the practice is to explain in the course of an instruction on the liturgy of the Mass, that it is a survival of antiquity when the celebrant received the offerings in kind, and one might add a picturesque touch by pointing out that the ceremonial washing of fingers at the Lavabo is a continuance of the washing of hands which of old was necessitated through the holding of the many loaves of bread and flasks of wine.

Plates containing money should never be left lying about in the sacristy, for even the best of altar boys are human, and it is not fair to put temptation in their way. In addition to those ordered by the Holy See, every diocese has its own special collections : these are usually made at the door, but the generosity of the faithful multiplies marvellously if they are made at the Post Communion.

A monthly collection for the Altar Society is always a success, and it can be worked up to a highly satisfactory average figure by indicating each time some definite purpose to which the takings of the day are to be assigned. It pleases the parishioners to be told that their contributions are to go directly to the service of the altar by way of the purchase of some such needful articles as wine, candles, oil. Moreover, this collection can be invested with a kind of solemnity by giving the responsibility of it to the brethren of the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament instead of the regular collectors : they should be asked to make it on their Holy Communion Sunday, and to wear their insignia.

Christmas and Easter offerings appear to be a peculiarly English institution of obscure origin. Perhaps we borrowed the admirable custom from the Church of England, and since the parsons have a legal right in the matter, it is not unlikely that the established church has continued something which existed in pre-Protestant days. In advertising Christmas and Easter offerings the methods of the clergy vary between two extremes ; some not hesitating to refer in detail to their personal needs, others being so sensitive

that they dread having to make so much as a bare mention of the subject. In the experience of many the best manner of approach is to say a few words drawing attention to a custom sanctioned by long standing which gives the faithful an opportunity of making a little present to their pastors for their personal use. The practice, in itself undesirable, of the clergy leaving the sanctuary in full vestments to go round with the plate themselves, has been strictly forbidden in some dioceses.

There is much to be said for the use of the envelope-system at Christmas and Easter ; it spares the feelings of those who do not want others to know what they give. We might even advantageously follow an example set by some of our brethren in U.S.A. ; they use envelopes bearing on the front an attractive coloured picture relating to the feast.

Finally it is well to make a point of thanking the faithful, and of letting them know the result of their generosity.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Cranmer's First Litany and Merbecke's Book of Common Prayer Noted, 1550. By J. Eric Hunt. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 7s. 6d.)

MR. ERIC HUNT and the publishers are to be congratulated on this excellent facsimile reproduction from the original printed edition of Merbecke.

It is a book of especial interest to musicians, but it should be of interest also to Catholics, for John Merbecke was one of those great Tudor composers that made English Church music famous throughout Europe. He was organist of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and composed a mass 'Per arma justitiae' for five voices, a remarkable work of fine technique. He also wrote two Latin motets and a carol. Merbecke was condemned to the stake by Henry VIII for Calvinist heresy, but Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, intervened on his behalf, and he was subsequently pardoned. Towards the end of Henry's reign, after the breach with Rome, changes were made in the service books and Henry ordered a litany to be set forth in English. Cranmer, replying to the King, writes: "I have travailed to make the version in English and have set the Latin note unto the same." It is generally thought that Merbecke was responsible for the musical arrangement of this.

On the accession of Edward VI, injunctions were issued that henceforth in the liturgy "no anthems are to be allowed but those of our Lord, and they in English, set to a plain and distinct note, for every syllable one". Then followed the First Book of Common Prayer in 1549, which, for the first time gathered together, in one volume and in the vernacular, all the services necessary for public worship. Merbecke's *Booke of Common Praier Noted* appeared in 1550, and contains "as much of the Order of Common Prayer as is to be sung in Churches". His work, drawn from the old chant (Sir R. Terry in a paper read to the Musical Association has traced Merbecke's melodies back to their original sources) is simple, yet strong and melodious and is eminently suitable for congregational worship. Merbecke fell rapidly into disuse, and it was left to those of the Oxford Movement to revive his work. Today Merbecke's setting for the Anglican

Communion Service is perhaps the most popular and best loved of all.

Mr. Hunt has added greatly to the interest of the book by chapters on the evolution of the Prayer Book and on the life of Merbecke. He, whose real genius is seen in his early compositions, forsook music for pamphleteering, and the extracts given from his writings must make sad reading not only for Catholics but also for all those who have become familiar with his Book of Common Prayer Noted.

W. S. B.

The *White List* of the Society of St. Gregory of America.
(J. Fischer & Bro., 119 West 40th Street, New York.
Price 75 cents.)

THE Society of St. Gregory of America are doing in the United States similar work to that which the English Society of the same name are doing in England. They have just issued a third and enlarged edition of their *White List*, the purpose of which is to afford the Catholic choir-master a choice of music that he may feel safe in securing for use in church by his choir. This implies that the compositions placed in the list have been tested and found to conform to those principles and regulations based on reason and contained in the positive enactments of the Church, especially in the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X. Although intended primarily for America, it should be of great help to the choir-master in this country. It gives a very comprehensive list—perhaps too comprehensive for some of us—of music; plain chant, polyphony and modern composers, all find a place; they are graded according to their difficulty, and in every case the name of the publisher (European as well as American) is given. Not the least valuable part of the book is the collection of extensive extracts from Papal documents on sacred music from the fourteenth to the twentieth century; quotations from Canon Law follow, and a helpful bibliography is added. This *White List* is something much more than a mere catalogue, and all those who are in any way interested in Church music, or are responsible for the choice of music in the services of the church would do well to have it by them.

W. S. B.

Our Case ; What we are Fighting for—and Why. By Christopher Hollis. Pp. 63. (Longmans. 1s. 6d. net.)

IN an atmosphere befogged by propaganda, slogans and impartial statements of the truth, Mr. Hollis' calm, impartial and reasoned vindication of "Our Case" comes as a most welcome assurance that we are at least this time on the side of the angels. The author is the more convincing and comforting because he makes no attempt to palliate any errors of British policy in the past, or to present the history of international relations since 1918 as the story of an unremitting effort on the part of this country to secure justice and prosperity for all. Rather he allows events to speak for themselves ; and as the reader follows those events, from the reoccupation of the Rhineland, to the Anschluss, the Czecho-Slovakian crisis and the seizure of Prague, and finally the fatal violation of Poland, he sees the issue becoming gradually clarified until it reached that clearness and urgency which called for the momentous declaration of the third of September. The German case, as seen by the "decent German", is likewise examined and is presented in these pages with a fairmindedness that none could impugn and with the insight of one who has long pleaded for the cause of Anglo-German friendship. The British cause, says Mr. Hollis, is the Christian cause ; but he concludes with a timely warning : "Let us frankly admit that if Germany has so largely ceased to be a Christian country, so, too, has England. . . . It is our business, if we would boast that ours is a Christian cause, not merely to say that England is a Christian country but to make it so."

We strongly recommend this work as a handbook for the clergy, who are likely often to be asked "what we are fighting for".

G. D. S.

The German Catholics. By Robert d'Harcourt ; translated by Reginald J. Dingle. Pp. 274. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

THE story of German Catholicism, like that of European culture, is contained in the tragic confession of Mgr. Grober, Bishop of Freiburg : "I was mistaken," he says, "in hoping that, as a result of the constantly repeated assertions of good-

will and co-operative spirit within the Third Reich, we might achieve an understanding with the National Socialist regime. Darker days are ahead of us and we must prepare for the worst."

That National Socialism is a perverse and barbaric doctrine has been the theme of many recent books, but by few of them has the poisonous and deadly character of its evil been made so clearly and objectively manifest as by M. d'Harcourt's work, which now appears in Mr. Dingle's excellent translation.

The author gives a fully documented history of the changing face of German Catholicism under first the threat and then the reality of Nazi power. He describes how the early condemnation of Hitlerism gave way to an uneasy optimism and how this optimism has in turn led to an inevitable disillusionment. "A whole people is in danger of losing its soul." "The youth are lost to the Church." "The old Church has been destroyed; a new Church will have to be built from the remnant that is saved." These are some of the remarks of thoughtful persons in Germany.

The cause of the present situation is made abundantly clear; the author traces the fundamentally anti-Christian attitude of Hitlerism back to its source in the mad national pride of its leader: "We will have none other gods than Germany. We must love Germany and believe in her fanatically."

M. d'Harcourt's masterly survey of the National Socialist movement in its relation to German Catholics comes opportunely. All who are engaged in the struggle against Hitlerism will derive from it, not only a profound conviction of the righteousness of their cause, but also a courageous confidence in the ultimate outcome. For the book ends on a note of quiet optimism and faith.

B. G.

Liturgical Asides. By Dom Hubert van Zeller, O.S.B.
Pp. xiii + 146. (Burns Oates & Washbourne.
3s. 6d.)

THE word Meditation has an almost sinister meaning for many people. Its mysterious syllables seem to give the impression that the thing itself must be difficult, but

since it is in point of fact natural to creatures (it is their converse with their Creator) Meditation is a far more simple matter than is commonly supposed. Nevertheless it is a subject that needs to be learned and taught. In the same way that Philosophy, a quite natural science, must be studied in order to be understood and applied, so also is it necessary for a man to be taught how to raise his mind and heart to God in prayer. Dom Hubert van Zeller here gives us what we may call another of his simple text-books for those who would learn to pray.

As the author himself says, although his work follows the liturgical year, it is in no way meant to be a substitute for the Missal, rather does it introduce the Missal, whetting one's desire for that best of all prayer books by isolating some of its most lovely gems. As an instance, mention may be made of this phrase in the Preface of the Requiem Mass: "For Thy faithful, life is changed, not taken away." It is obvious that a few moments' thought upon the meaning of these words will lift one's heart from earth to heaven in religious joy; and the author skilfully points out the direction in which the mind should be set in order to obtain this result. Again, he shows how perfectly placed in the calendar is the feast of the Immaculate Conception, which might seem at first sight to interrupt the Advent cycle almost as soon as it has begun. How truly Mary's feast belongs to Advent is immediately apparent when one remembers that she "heralds the Dawn, and brings the Light". Very happily indeed does Dom Hubert thus touch upon the year's liturgical beauties.

Some who turn the pages of this book will think it too colloquial for its purpose, and they will consider, as being too "chummy" and whimsical for prayer, such lines as these: "This is not a very good translation, Lord, but the Collects positively defy a decent rendering into English; even Thy servant, Fr. Martindale, is often put to it to make them sound at all presentable." The almost unvaried invocation "Lord" gets monotonous, although this would not be noticed by anyone using only a page or so at a reading. Our sorest complaint, however, is that we are so frequently given mere glimpses where a fixed gaze is so obviously called for. We would willingly sacrifice some of the other

Asides if, for example, the author had allowed us a satisfying conversation for Corpus Christi.

This book opens so wide a field of vision that one feels—and hopes—there must be companion volumes to follow. The author's inimitable style is as unimpaired as when he first took up his pen. He certainly succeeds in showing the attractiveness of prayer to those who pray with simplicity; and perhaps the most valuable lesson this little work inculcates is that far from being oppressive and tiring, saying one's prayers may be an exercise of ever fresh and easy delight.

L. T. H.

The Catechism through the Gospel. Adapted by a Religious of the Holy Child from the French of Abbé Eug. Charles. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. Price 5s.)

IN August 1936 the present reviewer contributed an article to the CLERGY REVIEW describing an experiment in the teaching of religion which had been carried out by the students of St. Mary's Training College, Strawberry Hill. The purpose of the experiment was to find out the best ways of correlating the teaching of Scripture with the teaching of the Catechism. The results were eminently satisfactory. Not only was it found that the Catechism itself was better learned and understood but the method had the additional advantages of arousing a new and inspiring interest in the religion lesson, of increasing the children's knowledge of the Scripture and of establishing in the children's minds the authoritative nature of the Catechism doctrine.

Many priests and teachers expressed a deep interest in the work but the chief practical difficulties for those who wished to use the method were the finding of suitable passages from the Scripture and the actual working out of lessons from the passages when found. A small pamphlet, *Catechism through the Scriptures*, helped somewhat with the first difficulty but little has been done to remedy the second until the appearance of the present work, *The Catechism through the Gospel*. Here all who are interested in the method and those who have never heard of it will find the materials necessary to give it a full and comprehensive trial. I venture to think that once tried, the method will never be completely abandoned.

The Catechism through the Gospels contains a complete course of lessons on the Catechism, based on extracts from the Sacred Scripture. Each lesson is a complete unit containing: (a) the Scripture extract; (b) a full commentary in which the doctrine is explained; (c) a short prayer suitable for the children; (d) a practical resolution based on the doctrine; (e) the text of the Westminster Catechism questions and answers which sum up the doctrine. For the benefit of Irish readers, the references to the Maynooth Catechism are given in numbers.

The order of the lessons follows the order of the Scripture—from the Creation to the Acts of the Apostles—rather than the order of the Catechism. For children this is an advantage as the dealings of God with man can be made more comprehensible to them in a synthetic, story form than in the analytic treatment of the act of Faith and the consequences of it. A course of religion for children which follows such a plan as, "Why Jesus came on earth—What Jesus taught—What Jesus did—What we should do", is certainly well calculated to appeal to their intelligence and to arouse practical response.

Father Charles has shown excellent judgement and skill in selecting passages suited to the demands of the work and the comprehension of the children. A good outline of the life of Our Lord is set before them as well as the full text of the Catechism. His commentaries on the text are simple and direct and teachers will find no difficulty in amplifying or simplifying them according to the age of the class. My only criticism is my regret that the commentaries do not include a graduated approach to the actual language of the Catechism text. Such an approach from the text of the Scripture through the children's own words to the technical language of the Catechism was a feature of the experiment to which I have referred and was regarded as a valuable feature of it. This work, however, can be readily supplied by the teacher.

So skilfully has the translator performed her task that it is difficult to believe that this book was not written originally in English. There is hardly a trace in language or idea of an attitude or mode of thought which is not thoroughly our own. Probably this is due to the basic Catholic foundation

of matter and method on the life and teaching of Christ which assures a universal appeal. However that may be, the translator deserves the thanks of all who teach religion to the young for putting this work of Father Charles at their disposal and for the care with which it has been adapted for their use. The book is no mere school text-book. Priests preparing instructions for young and even for adult congregations will find much help in the simply arranged expositions of doctrine and precept. "*Revelasti ea parvulis*" is a sound guide in making instructions practical.

Such a book has long been overdue. I welcome its appearance and confidently recommend it to all teachers of youth.

JAMES M. THOMPSON, C.M.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

Christ
y be,
ligion
their
apted
book.
adult
anged
vulis"

ne its
ers of

M.